Holy Cross College
Library

THIS BOOK IS NO LONGER THE
PROPERTY OF THE HOLY CROSS LIBRARY
Worcester,
Massachusetts

THIS BOOK IS NO LONGER THE
PROPERTY OF THE HOLY CROSS LIBRARY
Date Signed

ESSAYS ON VARIOUS SUBJECTS.

VOL. III.

Domus Soc. Jesu.
Providentiae.

ESSAYS

ON

VARIOUS SUBJECTS.

BY HIS EMINENCE,

CARDINAL WISEMAN.

IN SIX VOLUMES.

VOL. III.

Property of
CLgA
Please return to
Graduate Theological Union Library
1989

NEW YORK:
P. O'SHEA, 27 BARCLAY STREET.
1873.

8947

CONTENTS.

VOL. III.

PAGE

The Hampden Controversy..... 1

The High-Church Theory of Dogmatical Authority..... 31

"*Tracts for the Times.*" PART I. 99

"*Tracts for the Times.*" PART II. *Anglican Claims of Apostolical Succession*..... 151

"*Tracts for the Times.*" PART III. *The Catholic and Anglican Churches*..... 199

PREFACE.

In preparing this collection for publication, the reader may well suppose that this thought must have presented itself to the writer's mind: Would it not be better to suppress the whole of this controversy, which occupies this volume, as dead and gone, as either having attained its purpose, or not likely now any longer to attain it? Such a thought was natural, and connected with other feelings of which I may have to speak; but it was necessarily overruled by the motive of the entire work. Those persons, whose judgment I respect more than my own, who wished such a collection to be made, particularly desired that this series should not be omitted.

The strongest objection to be overcome in acceding to this wish was the painfulness of appearing in conflict with persons who are now joined with me in perfect unity of thought and principle, of many whom I respect, and even venerate, for their learning, their piety, and their orthodox zeal. But this consideration had its other side: for it may not be without its use to see how those who once clung to error through earnest conviction, who defended

their mistaken views with erudition and ability, but who, throughout, showed themselves sincere in the desire to attain truth, could nobly abandon that erroneous system when the moment of Grace arrived, and become far more powerful advocates than their former adversary of the Faith, which these pages represent them as opposing. It shows us how really we should be full of hope wherever there is sincerity; they bring home powerfully to our minds the words of St. Augustine: "Plerumque, cum tibi videris odisse inimicum, fratrem odisti, et nescis."*

But these words, at least, have not their full application here, and this is a strong motive with me for republishing these papers. If they exhibited not so much as hatred, but harshness even, or unkindness, towards those for whose sake they were written, I should be ashamed to put before the public the expression of feelings which must now appear most uncalled for and unjust. But it is a consolation to look back at those times and feel that every kind anticipation has been fulfilled, no expression of trustfulness disappointed. When the day of union came there was nothing to forgive on either side, nothing to regret. Each had written with earnestness, and even, perhaps, eagerness; but mutual respect had been observed, and on one side, I can answer for it, most affectionate interest had been felt; so that now I am sure that those very persons whose feelings, it may be thought, would be best consulted by suppressing all this matter,

* "Often, when you think you are hating an enemy, you are hating a [future] brother, and know it not."—In Psal. liv.

will be the first to admit that no unpleasant personal recollections will be awakened by recalling the memory of times when the united were disjointed only to manifest the amalgamating and unifying powers of God's Church.

I have already alluded, in the preface to the first volume, as well as in the body of this, to the first circumstance which turned my attention to the wonderful movement then commenced in England—the visit which is recorded in *Froude's Remains.* From that moment it took the uppermost place in my thoughts, and became the object of their intensest interest. It is but little remembered now how chillingly were met the views which they suggested; how little support they received from any single writer beyond the pages of the *Review;* how systematically they were opposed by our periodical press; how pamphlets were issued by perhaps more than one priest, with such titles as, "Are the Puseyites sincere?" And it is not known how friends remonstrated with the holder of hopeful views; how they treated him as an enthusiast, or rather a fanatic, who was digging a pit of bitter disappointment for his own feet; how even the most learned of our historians wrote in friendly warning to remind him of the vain hopes raised and doomed to bitter disappointment at the times of Laud and of the Nonconformists, and asked him what he saw in the present movement that gave better grounds of reliance than experience had proved to exist then. Even those so situated as to have near them the evidences which convinced him of hopeful advance, viewed them in a very different light, and thought

their importance, to say the least, much exaggerated.

At the same time a serious danger had to be avoided. No concessions could be made to error beyond the acknowledgment of sincere belief that it was unconscious. To have allowed it to possess a single mark or element of Catholicity, to have admitted a particle of the specious theory of apostolic succession, silent, unrecognized communion with the Church, and possession of sacramental power by the national establishment, would have been both false in theology and pernicious in practice. It would have encouraged a delusion which, undisturbed, might have laid many asleep in a fatal contentment who now repose in peaceful security in the bosom of their Mother the Church. No real love for those involved in this state could be shown except by energetic endeavors to snatch them from it. Whoever, therefore, wished to be truly their best friend, had to make up his mind to appear their most unrelenting opponent.

Besides the pain which such a position inflicted, it had its further difficulties. The theories propounded in the High-Church system were new and totally different from any aspect which Protestantism had really assumed since the Reformation. They were put forward by men, some of whom brought to their work great ecclesiastical learning, while others contributed acute reasoning power, and constructive skill. The entire system was built with great apparent consistency, such as to deceive its very architect, who believed it to be planned and raised upon orthodox and primitive models.

There could be little hope of undeceiving them, except by pursuing them on to their own ground, and finding there the instruments of assault. Reasoning had to be met by reasoning ; a mistaken, by a truer reading of antiquity.

To undertake this work was the aim and undeviating purpose of the essays here collected together, and they will consequently be found to present various forms. To say that they proceeded from the beginning on a complete and preconcerted plan would be not only an exaggeration but a false assumption of sagacity. They followed the course of fresh events and new publications, till by degrees more accurate views were obtained of the opposite system, and then it was felt necessary to attack it in its foundation. This led to a more theological discussion, in which the principles of the ancient Church were collected and applied to the existing controversy. While acknowledging the immense imperfection of every part of these essays, it would be ungrateful not to express what consolation has been derived from the information, after many years of unconsciousness, so graciously and affectionately conveyed, that they had exercised a material influence on minds so infinitely superior in every way to their writer's, by awakening attention to arguments which those minds were peculiarly able to develop for themselves.

However, such as they are, these papers form the only body of Catholic controversy on the subject during several years, and until they for whom they were written, happily standing on our side, took up the weapons which their experience made

a hundred times more powerful and effectual, and rendered it both unnecessary and presumptuous for earlier writers to keep the field. After the wonderful lectures on Anglican difficulties, and the smaller treatises by so many other learned converts, as Capes, Thompson, Renouf, Wilberforce, Belany, Lewis, Allies, Northcote, the lists may be considered as about closed; and scarcely an objection can be anticipated which has not been forestalled and answered. These writers, and especially the honored and venerated Superior of the Oratory, have amply paid back, as children can do to parents, whatever solicitude the Church may have at one time entertained for their welfare.

And let me become selfish once more, before I close. If, during the years of affectionate opposition which preceded the happy hour of our union, I can say that I never was unhopeful or unloving, so will I with equal assurance assert, that since that period I have never been for a moment suspicious or distrustful. Protestant writers and Protestant speakers chose to say that unkindnesses, or jealousies, or doubtfulness, had arisen between some converts and myself. This was a simple untruth; for which, nor act, nor word, nor thought, could furnish the semblance of a ground. Whether it sprung up complete as an invention, or grew imperceptibly as a rumor, I give it a most unqualified contradiction.

And now let my conclusion be in the form of an earnest and affectionate request: that if any of my readers shall remember to have formerly received profit, however small, from any passage now re-

printed in this volume, he will kindly more than repay it by a short and fervent prayer, that he who has here presumed to preach to others may not, through neglected graces, himself become a cast-away.

LONDON, *April* 23, 1853.

THE

HAMPDEN CONTROVERSY.

[From the *Dublin Review* for May, 1836.]

Art. XI.—1. *Inaugural Discourse read before the University of Oxford in the Divinity School, on Thursday, March* 17, 1836. By R. D. HAMPDEN, D. D., Regius Professor of Divinity. London, 1836.

2. *A Letter to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, explanatory of the Proceedings at Oxford.* London, 1836.

3. *Elucidations of Dr. Hampden's Theological Statements.* London, 1836.

4. *Dr. Hampden's Theological Statements and the Thirty-nine Articles compared.* London, 1836.

WE feel obliged to confess that in looking over the controversial tracts which the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the theological chair of Oxford has called into being, our minds have been crossed by feelings which we scarcely know how to reconcile together, or even to analyze, with satisfaction to ourselves. On the one hand we see learned and zealous, and we have reason to believe, in some instances, amiable men, contending, in the spirit which belongs to a better Church and a better cause, in favor of a rigid adherence to

principles and doctrines which *we* must approve; yet, thereby departing from the consistency of their professed faith, and betraying how powerless they are in wielding the weapons which it has long since blunted, and then thrown aside. On the other side, we see the professor *elect* accused, not unjustly, of rash and dangerous opinions in his earlier works, but yet most unjustly cited to answer for them, upon principles which his accusers themselves had no right to adopt. For he is charged not so much with heterodoxy in faith, as with violating articles, that can pretend to no power of binding the internal belief.

But the anomalies of the system, which this controversy has exposed, are still further exhibited by the new position, wherein the professor *installed* has placed himself. His inaugural discourse appears; in it all is conformable to what his opponents could require; the doctrine of the Trinity is no longer the result of "a combination of the judgments of speculative reason, with the prescriptions of authority," or "an exact scientific view of the principle of causation;"* the sacramental influence is no longer the consequence of a "general belief in magic in the early ages of the Church;"† transubstantiation is no more a doctrine which, as "a simple opinion, might have had no harm in it;"‡ but all is just what the most zealous supporter of the church articles could

* Theological Statements, pp. 17, 19.

† Ib. p. 58. ‡ Ib. p. 61.

desire; the Trinity, as in them taught, cannot be denied "without expunging the Scriptures themselves,"* the sacrament of regeneration is efficacious as a means of grace, through Christ's blessing, "so as to be indispensable to all within the reach of it;"† and, as a peace-offering perhaps to more relentless spirits, transubstantiation is "rejected as a fond notion."‡ Not only in these points, but in many others, the impartial reader of the works before us will see manifest variations of opinion, not to say glaring contradictions.

But is the blame of this to be cast upon Dr. Hampden? Assuredly not. Had he been a teacher in our Church, had he made his confession of faith among us, we might have been startled at such a change; because we could have discovered no principle in the mind of a Catholic theologian, whereby it could be justified. But where the religion itself admits the possibility of variation in the whole collective Church, and supposes, that to-day it may be plunged into idolatry or gross superstition, and to-morrow rise regenerated and purified from the laver of a reformation, it is surely unreasonable to expect that its individual teachers shall have preserved consistency through the growing experience of life. We do not mean to insinuate that the professor's chair can have, or has had, a magical influence upon the opinions of its occupant, or that it is an infallible nostrum for the cure of heterodoxy. For the professor's adver-

* Inaugural Lect. p. 9. † P. 14. ‡ Ibid.

saries absolve him from all *formal* guilt in this respect, as the schoolmen call it. Dr. Pusey says, that what they have written, "it should be plainly understood, has not been done with any idea of passing judgment upon the personal faith of Dr. Hampden." "On the contrary," he adds, "we believe that the earlier faith planted in the soul yet survives, and we trust and pray that it may survive, unharmed if possible, by the later philosophical system, which has been admitted into the intellect."* The report of the Committee, appointed, March 5, by the Corpus meeting, makes the same declaration, and is careful in stating that "they are far from imputing to Dr. Hampden personally those unchristian doctrines, with which his system [characterized in the preceding paragraph as the *theory of rationalism*] is closely connected, or the consequences inevitably flowing from it."†

Here, then, is an admission of inward orthodoxy in the accused professor, while his outward teaching is in direct opposition to the principles of faith which he has professed, and to the articles of religion which he has solemnly subscribed. Yet even here there is no inconsistency upon the principles maintained by distinguished divines of the English Church; though the order of proceeding is obviously reversed. For Dr. Hampden is acknowledged inwardly to believe according to the doctrines prescribed, and only charged with out-

* Theological Statements, p. iii.

† Letter to His Grace the Archb. of Canterbury, p. 32.

wardly professing what is at variance with them; whereas the more ordinary theory is, that the subscribers of the articles may in their hearts reject them, while outwardly they shape their teaching in conformity to them. Which species of discrepancy between the heart and the hand is the more reprehensible, we leave candid readers to determine. Bishop Bramhall says of the thirty-nine articles, that they are "only pious opinions fitted for the preservation of unity; neither do we oblige any man to believe them, but only not to contradict them."* Dr. Hey, when actually Norrisian professor of theology in the sister University, asserted in his Lectures that "the sense of the articles is to be determined by circumstances." Dr. Balguy is still more explicit, for he says: "The articles are not exactly what we might wish them to be. Some of them are expressed in doubtful terms; others are inaccurate, perhaps unphilosophical; others, again, may chance to mislead an ignorant reader into some erroneous opinions; but is there any one among them that leads to immorality?" Such is his opinion of the articles; now hear what he says of subscription and mental adherence to them: "I am far from wishing to discourage the clergy of the established church from thinking for themselves, or from speaking what they think, nor even from writing. I say nothing

* This is the language so severely blamed in Dr. H. "Pious opinions (such as the doctrinal statements of our articles) are not parts of revelation."—Elucidations, p. 43.

against the right of private judgment or speech, I only contend that men ought not to attack the church from those very pulpits in which they were placed for her defence."

Now, Dr. Balguy, as Dr. Milner remarks,* was the most strenuous opposer of those clergymen, who, in 1772, petitioned the legislature to be relieved from the burden of subscription; and his sermons, from which this passage is drawn, were dedicated to the king. The theory therefore of these, and many other divines of the Establishment, whom we could quote, is, that the articles are not obligatory on the conscience, but only "articles of peace," which need not be believed, but must not be publicly, or rather *officially*, impugned. And if in Dr. Balguy's text we simply substitute *chair* for *pulpit*, Dr. Hampden's justification is complete; nay, he may go on still philosophizing on the articles and analyzing them in speech and writing, till he has sublimated them into a vapory breath, so long as from the chair which he now holds, he shall not gainsay their solidity!

Surely this is strange doctrine; but it is not ours; it is the strait to which the right of freedom in religious opinion on the one side, and the exacted submission to subscription on the other, have, by alternate and repeated blows, driven the theological science of the Establishment. It is the doctrine not merely of this, but of foreign communions too: the clergy of Geneva continued to sub-

* "End of Religious Controversy," Let. xi.

scribe to the Divinity of our Lord, long after belief in that doctrine had been openly disavowed among them: Michaelis maintains that the adhesion, by subscription, to formularies of faith, only extends to outward profession, and not to interior conviction;* and Sembler bitterly complained that men should be compelled to subscribe such documents, when, according to the very principles of the Reformation, it was tyrannical to exact a profession of belief even in the inspiration of Scriptures.† But if such has been the belief of so many dignitaries and lights of the Protestant Church, Dr. Hampden has surely no reason to be challenged and summoned before any tribunal, for acting in conformity with it. On the contrary, we fancy he has not come up to the measure of dispensation to which those opinions and declarations seem to entitle the conscience; for, once more, we observe, that he is acquitted of believing anything at variance with the established creed.

How, then, are we to solve this mystery, and account for the jealousy now felt regarding the *former* opinions of Dr. Hampden? Did not a prelate of the English Church, of whom, as laden with years and infirmity, we wish not harshly to speak,

* In an Essay on the Possibility of Effecting a Union of Religions, in his "Commentationes, R. S. Götting prælectæ." Not having the work at hand, we cannot refer more accurately.

† In his Preface to his Abridgment of Schultens's Commentary on Proverbs.

translate and make known in this country one of the most dangerous, because one of the most covert and moderate, rationalists of Germany? and did not his notes, partly by not reaching through the entire work, partly by the dilutedness of their antidote, by their illustrating rather than removing the danger, greatly add to the mischief? And yet if Dr. Herbert Marsh was the importer and propagator of rationalism, was not the Margaret Professor, and the Bishop of Peterborough, a zealous churchman, and the unrelenting foe to popery? Ought not this example to have given hopes of others, that when placed in high places of responsibility, the spirit of their order would come forth, and flourish perhaps the fresher, for their early and partial blight? But it is not difficult to discover the secret springs which have been here at work; and inasmuch as therein are found the latent germs of principles which we would gladly see avowed in the face of heaven, we must feel an interest in watching the course of the accusation.

That the individuals who call Dr. Hampden to account are leading men among the high church party, is sufficiently understood. The history of this section of the Anglican Church it is not our province to trace; but we believe that we may compare it to the theory which Dr. Gilly and other fanciful writers have imagined for that Church itself.* For, these gentlemen, unable to get rid

* See the Rev. James Wheeler's short, but triumphant, reply to Dr. Gilly's work entitled, "Our Protestant Forefathers." Durham, 1835.

of the universal domination of popery during so many centuries, have devised a species of mythological protestantism, which, like the Homeric deities, was invisible, save occasionally as a thin vapory phantasm appearing amidst the turmoil of controversial warfare, but yet really existed in its Idas and Olympuses amidst the mountains of Savoy, until it came forth, in bodily substance, as a celestial Avatar, from the head of Luther. And so do we really believe that the party in the Church, to which Dr. Hampden's impugners belong, hold their only true and semi-invisible Church to have existed pure, until this day, amidst the wilder theories of Protestantism; always bearing with it some precious remnants and relics of good old Catholicity, upholding the authoritative teaching of Christ's Church, and the true efficacy of His sacraments, and reverencing, and perhaps regretting, many of those institutions, which the hurricane of the Reformation recklessly swept away.

The genealogy of this church-party is easily traced, with occasional breaks, from one advocate to another of principles too obviously Catholic; sometimes the depreciators of ecclesiastical rule are for a brief space the lords of the ascendant, at others the star of the church culminates in the political and literary sphere; but still it has ever continued to live, and the opinions, which this controversy have brought out, have circulated, with alternations of languor and of activity, through the

body of the Establishment. In the "Report" above alluded to, the head and front of Dr. Hampden's offending is, his having no "regard to those rules and principles of interpretation which have guided *the judgments* of Christ's Holy Catholic Church in all ages of its history, and under every variety of its warfare."*

Again, the committee write as follows:—

"They [the committee] suggest and submit it [a declaration] to you, as a measure, which, while it removes from us a charge of supineness or indifference, may warn the younger part of our students against immediate danger, and will solemnly declare to the world *our resolution to hold fast those great laws of Scripture-interpretation and Scripture-Proof, which we inherit from our ancestors in the faith.*"—P. 33.

Is this Oxford or Salamanca that speaks? Is it Corpus Christi College or the Sorbonne? First, a dogmatical condemnation of opinions; secondly, a censure on the same; thirdly, the *judgments* of the Church; fourthly, this is no other than the *Holy Catholic Church;* fifthly, this Church guided *through all ages* by the same *sound* principles, for this is implied in the jealousy wherewith they are to be guarded; sixthly, these same *sound* principles in all ages observed *in every warfare*, therefore against Berengarius, Wicklif, the Waldenses —why not Luther? seventhly, these principles to be derived from ancestors in the faith; eighthly, no law of Scripture-proof to be admitted save what is thus inherited;—surely these are not the distinctive principles, and acts, and terms of a Protestant

* Letter, p. 32.

clergy, and a Protestant University! We doubt not that those who signed the Report would reply in the affirmative, and seriously and earnestly maintain that such has always been the conduct and the belief of their Church. Alas! we wish it had been so. For had these principles been always practically upheld in England, never would the sad separation have occurred which has rent this country from its mother Church. Others, however, will not so easily see the conformity between these principles and those whereon the Reformation was originally based; but will refuse to believe that the thick wall of separation which it was intended at the era of that event to place between popery and the new religion was in reality so thin a film as it must here appear. The author of the Letter to his Grace of Canterbury, reads Catholicity in every line of the Report. For thus he writes:—

"I venture to affirm, without risk of contradiction, or at least of confutation, that the doctrine involved in both the above-cited passages is much more manifestly at variance with the characteristic principle of Protestantism, and with the practice of the English Established Church, than any doctrine extracted from Dr. Hampden's writings."—P. 37.

Again—

"The Roman Catholic doctrine would, if such admission were made, have a manifest advantage over every Protestant church, inasmuch as the rules and principles of her interpretation, and her interpretation itself, if not more ancient or more uniform, have unquestionably been more prevalent during many ages of the Church, and have been more dis-

tinctly inherited from ancestors in the same faith, than any articles, expositions, or confessions of faith, adopted by the Church of England, or recommended by any Protestant community on earth. I know not to what conclusions a theory like Dr. Hampden's, founded on the belief of the Scriptures, and entire freedom in interpreting them, might lead a rash or intrepid disputant; but I am morally certain that the slavish doctrines propounded in the Corpus Report would compel every consistent reasoner, who adopted it, to acknowledge an *infallible* Church. When we once start on the line of *infallibility*, it is obvious at what goal we must arrive.—*Tendimus in Latium.* We may bawl out No Popery! on the road, but we must put up at the Old Lady of Babylon's at last."—P. 40.

This is consistent reasoning; and we can forgive some words in it which we like not, in consideration of its general sense. It is only another illustration of what Catholics have repeatedly observed, that if two contending parties arise in the Protestant Church, the one is driven to tax the other with Socinianism, and that other retorts with the accusation of popery. It only confirms what every Catholic must feel, that the rejection of a principle of authority necessarily leads, theoretically at least, to the rejection of all mystery, and so to Socinianism, while its adoption obliges its supporters to reason on principles purely Catholic. This tendency of the party at Oxford to run into Catholic principles for shelter, has necessarily attracted the attention of many. It has been ingeniously developed by the author of a clever pamphlet entitled a "Pastoral Epistle from His Holiness the Pope to some Members of the University of

Oxford." Imitating in some respect Sir. R. Steele's witty device of a letter to the Pope, complaining that the Protestant Church laid claim to as much authority and infallibility as himself, the writer introduces the Sovereign Pontiff in person, accepting and commending the opinions set forth in the "Tracts for the Times," by members of that University. In reading this ingenious production, we could not help sometimes imagining that a feeling better than mere love of sarcasm came over the writer's mind, and that his imagination gradually warmed with his subject into an enthusiastic regret, that he could not say in truth what seemed so beautiful even in sportive phrase. One instance of text and commentary will suffice to explain our meaning. The Tracts write as follows:—

"The Catholic ritual was a precious possession; and if we who have escaped from popery have lost not only the possession, but the sense of its value, it is a serious question, whether we are not like men who recover from some grievous illness with the loss or injury of their sight or hearing:—whether we are not like the Jews returned from captivity, who could never find the rod of Aaron, or the ark of the covenant, which indeed had ever been hid from the world, but then was removed from the temple itself."—Tract, No. xxxiv.

Upon this passage, the Pope is thus imagined to comment:

"Oh, when you have returned to the temple, with what joy will you behold the rod of Aaron and the ark of the covenant still preserved in its mystic depositaries! With what delight will you behold the splendor of our ritual! What new sensations of piety will throb within your bosoms, as you prostrate yourselves with reverence before our holy

altar. The ark of the covenant will be presented to your view; the real cross will offer itself to your vision; the relics of holy martyrs will animate your devotions; nor will you be pained by the absence of the prayer (which you say has been excluded from the English ritual) 'for the rest and peace of all those who have departed this life in God's faith and fear.' You have justly remarked, that 'prayers for the dead' formed a portion of those liturgies which have emanated from St. Peter, St. James, St. Mark, and St. John;* and when you join us in these devotions, you will feel a new proof within you, that the Church which has retained this office is alone worthy of your regard."—P. 25.

Sincerely do we believe that the writer of these words, in true dramatic feeling, invested, or rather identified, himself with the character which he personated, and could not but feel the æsthetic beauty, at least, of the ordinances which he recommends. Gladly do we adopt his language, and with all the earnestness of sincere zeal, and all the cordiality of brotherly charity, express our assurance that what he writes is but the truth; and that the emotions which he describes are the real and consistent consequences of practically adopting what that party theoretically approves.

We are not chimerical in our views, nor over sanguine in our expectations; but we are confident that if the divines who have censured Dr. Hampden would calmly look upon their principles, without the dread of popery in their hearts to stifle better feeling, if they would fearlessly pursue their own doctrines to their furthest consistent conclusions, they would surely find that they

* Tracts, No. xliii.

have unguardedly, perhaps unknowingly, rejected the principles of the Reformation, and returned to thoughts and feelings which belong to other times, or at least to another Church. Unfortunately, experience, trite and vulgar as it may be, has sanctioned the aphorism, that the repulsive action between two religions, the *odium theologicum* (the substantive we reject most heartily on the Catholic side), is in the inverse ratio of the square of their distance: and therefore we fear that any of those who have been zealously trying Catholic weapons against the alleged semi-Socinianism of the Regius Professor, would turn round and be as ready to close with us in wager of battle, did we but tap him on the shoulder, and politely hint that he had taken, by mistake, our sword and buckler. But we are willing to hope that times are mended; and that a better spirit, a generous love of truth, has descended among our generation, and that we may safely argue our cause, without danger of exciting any unworthy feelings. Let us then gird up our loins, and contend together in a friendly spirit.

Nothing can be more clear, as we before explained, than that, in the Established Church, there has been a series of learned divines whose opinions approximated greatly to those of Catholics; who thought that the Reformation, however necessary, overdid its work. They have regretted the licentiousness of religious opinion which it introduced, by removing the wholesome and neces-

sary restraint of a dogmatic authority in the Church. But is it fair to identify the opinions of these men, however learned, with the Establishment to which they belonged? Were they, in the first place, ever considered otherwise than as a party, or, if you prefer it, a *part* of the Anglican Church? Were there not always many who opposed them in their views? Can it even be said that the great bulk of the flock followed them in their doctrines, and claimed not, rather in their despite, the privilege of individual judgment? And has not the growing increase of sectarianism proved that the body of their Church insists on this right, and exercises it to the utmost? And in the second place, is not the very complaint, so constantly uttered by this party, of too much having been done at the Reformation, the regret that outward pomp of worship, and many religious institutions were then abolished, a sufficient proof that they represent not those who caused and accomplished that unhappy revolution?

No one, we believe, save themselves, will maintain that they represent the English Church, such as the Reformation intended it to appear, in harsh and unyielding contrast to the Catholic doctrine on the subject. But let us proceed in our examination. It is supposed, then, that the Church of England, as conceived by these divines, holds and maintains an authority in matters of faith. Several important questions immediately arise.

First, we would ask, where does this definitive

power reside? The Catholic not only believes that his Church possesses such an authority, but at once unhesitatingly declares where it is deposited. He holds that the pastors of the Church, in council assembled, are assisted by the Holy Spirit to a certainty of decision. The case is contemplated and provided for; he can tell you who may call such an assembly—who must preside at it—by whom its decrees must be ratified—how they are to be promulgated—what extent of obligation they may impose. All is as clear, as definite, as regular, as the provisions of the statute-book for the legislative functions of our national council. The dogma is complete, and it is carried fearlessly, like every other Catholic principle, to its furthest consequences. But if the Protestant English Church has authority, in whose hands is it placed? Suppose that a serious controversy arose within it; —suppose that these its zealous members wished to pronounce judgment upon Dr. Hampden's opinions, whose duty would it become? Would the convocation meet for the purpose; or would each University have dogmatical authority? Would the Archbishop of Canterbury be justified by precedent, or by usage, or by inherent right, to call a council of the English Church, and at its head pronounce an authoritative decision? Surely, if their doctrine were that of their Church, there would have been proper provision made in its articles for it; and a Protestant child would be able to tell you, as a Catholic one can, where the au-

thority of his Church reposes. Instead of this, we have a vague clause in the 20th Article, that it has authority in matters of faith. But this very clause is most probably spurious and interpolated ;* and its power is completely annulled by its contradictory restrictions.†

In the next place, we would ask, how is this power to be exercised? If it exists, or is believed to exist, God knows there have been plenty of occasions in our days to call it into activity. We cannot, indeed, imagine more urgent cases for its application than many which have arisen. Socinianism has stalked abroad in open day, and in the high places of the Church; fanaticism and self-sufficiency have rent vast masses from its communion into sectarianism; latitudinarianism has crept like a subtle poison through its ranks; and yet we never see, and never have seen, this Church arouse itself to exercise its privilege of dispelling error, and sealing with its sanction the orthodox faith. Nay, it has been even cogently urged: how came it that Dr. Hampden, after delivering his "theory of rationalism" in the Bampton Lectures, was successively made principal of St. Mary's Hall, doctor of divinity, and professor of moral theology? ‡ If the Church take cognizance of opinions, or claim

* See the Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church, by N. Wiseman, D. D., now publishing, Lect. ii. p. 36, note.

† Ib. pp. 29, 30.

‡ Letter, p. 5. [And since, bishop of Hereford.]

the right of condemning erroneous doctrines, either it is sadly inefficient for its purpose, or it must wait very extreme cases for the exercise of its power. Then what is the form in which its decisions are issued? Are they merely declarations of its own belief, or are they positive definitions in the name of God, and with the supposed guidance of His Spirit? Would they be decisions binding on the consciences of men, or only motives to be weighed by them in coming, in their private judgment, to a right conclusion? These again are all matters which a Catholic well understands, simply because his Church claims and exercises a right of deciding in matters of faith; and they would be as explicit in the Church of England, did it pretend to a similar power.

After this, we would ask, how is this right, if exercised, to be enforced? For, as a wise old poet writes,—

> "The laws live, only where the law doth breed
> Obedience to the works it binds us to."

Do those who have signed the Corpus declaration or report, imagine that the body of Churchmen are aware of a deposit of principles being in their hands, "inherited from ancestors in the faith," which alone are available for Scripture-proof, and Scripture-interpretation; so that all will bow implicitly, upon some one endowed with proper authority—who we know not—coming forward and stating, in a dogmatical tone, that such only is the true doctrine, *because* it is that of the Church? Would

not such a decision be as the apple of discord among their ranks, and raise the war-cry of Popery against them?

How different the case is in the Catholic Church, the experience of our own times may abundantly declare. It is not long since a bold and mighty genius,* after having fought and conquered the rampant infidelity of the last age, and indifference, its baneful progeny, in this, had gathered around him a band of fresh and youthful minds, free from either taint, panting after what is pure and holy, and eager to be led, under his banner, to the sacred war. In an ill-fated hour he swerved, like Tertullian, from the very principles by which he had so often confuted error; and suffered the suggestions of an enthusiastic imagination to prevail over the former convictions of his mind. The Head of the Church pronounced his award of disapprobation—he yielded not; but he has ever since stood like a scathed and shattered oak, which the lightning hath touched, the energies of his mind exhausted, the intellectual sap dried up; and of all those whom he trained and cherished, not one has followed him in his disobedience; they have all wept and mourned over his fall, but their principles have been stronger than their affections, and they have remained banded together, but under the best and only sure guide—the Church itself which they defend.†

* [The Abbé de la Mennais.]

† It is this hopeful phalanx, in great part, which has undertaken the publication of the new journal, entitled the *Université Catholique.*

Another and a more remarkable instance has occurred. At Strasbourg, the love of philosophizing in religion, precisely the fault found with Dr. Hampden, had led away into rash opinions one whose learning and virtues were an ornament to the clergy; and as one great star may draw after it a third part of the host of heaven, so had he brought into the same dangerous opinions others of a kindred spirit. His bishop condemned and expostulated, and the authority invested in him soon triumphed. On the 18th of last November the erring parties signed a declaration, wherein they virtually renounced their opinions, and this was next day published by the bishop to his flock, for their edification. The most striking circumstance, however, is that the chief of this party was a convert, at a rather advanced period of life, from Protestantism; his mind had not been accustomed from infancy to habitual respect for such authority: but so essential must this feeling appear to any one that embraces Catholicity, and so fast does it seize upon his mind, that its power becomes superior to every other influence, and secures him against its action. And to the Catholic, the man who could thus sacrifice every selfish idea and feeling of pride to this beautiful and most sacred principle, is greater in mind and soul than all the glories of a brilliant philosophy could ever make its founder.*

* [The ecclesiastic here alluded to now occupies a high position in the clergy of Paris, and his principal disciple is bishop of a French see.]

Here, then, is manifestly a Church which claims to rule by authority and power. The entire system of its construction shows this vital principle; but try to trace the necessary organs for a correspondent action in the Anglican Church, which some affect to think lives by a similar power, and you will blunt your dissecting-knife in vain. You will not discover any means, or any force requisite for such a principle. In fact nothing, we believe, is generally considered more clear than that this belief or theory is an opinion *in*, and not *of*, the English Church; nay, that it goes greatly to overthrow, or weaken, the fundamental principles of the Reformation.

It is indeed easy, and, we will add, distressing, to see how carefully the terms used by Catholics on these subjects are shunned; there seems to be a fear of too plainly betraying the esoteric doctrines of the sect; nay more, a dread of fairly looking them in the face, lest they should seem to resemble Popery. It is manifest, that if the principles of these learned collegians were boldly pushed forward to their last and consistent consequences, the establishment of the Catholic doctrine must necessarily ensue.

Divines of this class, whether living or dead, have been more than once subservient to the spread of Catholicity. The late Mr. Vaughan, of Leicester, was ever most assiduous in preaching to his Protestant flock, on the High Church doctrine of authority in matters of faith, on the sin of dissent,

and the unsafety of those who submitted and adhered not to the Church; and the consequence was that several of his congregation, convinced by his arguments, but following them up to their real conclusions, passed over to the Catholic faith, and became zealous members of our holy religion. We had the pleasure of being acquainted with one who for years had exercised the ministry in the Establishment, but became a convert to the truth, and, in his old age, took orders in the Church.* We asked him, on one occasion, by what course he had been brought to embrace our religion, with so many sacrifices. He informed us that he had always been a zealous High Churchman, and had studied and held the opinions of the old English divines. He had thus firmly upheld the authority of the Church; he had believed in the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Blessed Eucharist; he had regretted the destruction of ceremony and religious symbols in worship; and had fully satisfied himself, on the authority of his leaders, that many Catholic practices, usually much decried, were blameless, and might be even salutary. His religious principles being thus formed upon the doctrines of that school, he could not avoid noticing that, practically, they were not held by the Church in which he had learnt them; he looked around him for some place where they might be found, and, to his astonishment, discovered, that among Catholics alone his theory of

* [The late Rev. Sir Harry Trelawney.]

Christianity existed, in a perfect and harmonious scheme. He had little or nothing to change; he merely transferred his allegiance from a party to a Church, and became a Catholic, that he might remain a consistent Anglican!

Dr. Hampden, in his inaugural discourse, seems to us no less confused and fearful of boldly facing his opinions, regarding the relative value of Scripture, and of authority. He obviously wishes to give a certain weight to the latter; and, did our space permit us, we should be glad to analyze his consequences, mutually contrasted. It would be found that the authority attributed to the Church is so vague and ill-defined as to amount to a mere name; that it is but an interpretative authority, which resides no one can tell where, and is to be exercised nobody knows how.*

A similar contradiction is discoverable in his professions on the Blessed Eucharist. On this subject he thus writes:—

"Our Church, indeed has rejected the fond notion of transubstantiation; but does not, therefore, the less hold *a real vital presence* of Christ in the sacrament. The Church forbids our holding the doctrine of a *corporal* presence, and yet does not presume to overlook the strong words of Christ, declaring, 'this is my body,' 'this is my blood,' 'and he that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him;' and will not, therefore, incur the impiety of emptying this holy sacrament of its gifted treasure of grace. And thus, it is asserted in the Catechism, that the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."—P. 14.

* See his Inaug. Lecture, p. 18.

Our Blessed Saviour yet exists in the body; at the right hand of the Father He sits with our glorified flesh, from which He is no more to be severed. To say that He is *really* present, and yet not *bodily* present, is a new mystery, involving delicate points of sublime theology, nowhere revealed in Scripture. Dr. H. admits the force, not only of the instituting formula, but even of the long-contested sixth chapter of St. John, which he here applies towards proving that the sacrament is not a mere symbol, but contains the *real* presence of our Saviour. But surely so accurate a distinction between one sort of presence and another should have been drawn in the New Testament; and to conclude, inductively of the Eucharist, "*here is* the body of Christ," when He said, "*This is* my body,"—and reject as *fond* the doctrine which takes the latter proposition quite literally, is a strange perversion of all logical propriety. For, are the words to be taken literally, so as to include a real presence? Then transubstantiation, which so takes them, is no fond notion. Are they to be interpreted figuratively? Then there is no farther ground for Dr. Hampden's *real*, *vital* presence. To say they shall be taken literally so far and no farther, is drawing a line of which we require a demonstration. Moreover, if, according to the learned doctor, the *real* presence is evinced by a passage which tells us that Christ's *flesh* and *blood* are received, it is not easy to see how such an expression, at the same time, con-

demns a *corporal* presence. It would be difficult more positively to express this than by its constituents, *flesh* and *blood*. There is another error in this paragraph. We are told that the "English Church forbids our holding the doctrine of a corporal presence;" and yet the Catechism is quoted to prove that the body and blood of Christ are really taken. Now we believe that it is pretty well ascertained that the Catechism was so framed upon this head as to allow, by the wideness of its meshes, Catholics to enter into the net; that the doctrine of the Eucharist, in it, was purposely kept so vague, as to be reconcilable with our belief; and that, therefore, the cited words were purposely intended to *include*, and not to forbid the Catholic dogma of a corporal presence. The entire Catechism offends more by omission than by actual error, at least if we except one answer, which, after all, is equivocal. We allude to the number of sacraments, as there stated: "Two only, *as generally necessary for salvation*, that is to say, baptism and the supper of the Lord." This may be so interpreted as not to exclude the other five, but only to declare those which are necessary for all; and in this sense the answer is correct.

It is time, however, for us to conclude. Of Dr. Hampden we say once more, that whatever discrepancy there may be between his former doctrines and the Church articles, or the opinions of his opponents, it should not be laid to his charge, where latitude of opinion has been always consid-

ered a privilege and a right. The Government has been severely blamed for appointing him to a chair, after the University had conferred three successive dignities on him, since his ill-starred Lectures. This censure we think likewise unjust. We believe that had the Government appointed any of those who signed the Report, or appealed to His Grace of Canterbury, they would have sanctioned a wider departure from the acknowledged principles of Anglicanism than they can possibly have sanctioned now. For the doctrines which that party maintain, however they approximate nearer to what we hold for truth, are as widely dissentient from the very basis of Protestantism, as those of the new Professor.

Do we mean then to join in the clamor which has been raised against them? Assuredly not. We gladly close our eyes to all consideration of personal motives or feelings which have been thought to prevail in this controversy, and we are willing to look upon it solely as a struggle of contending principles. For we believe that sincere regret has been felt by this party, at what they consider the exaltation of opinions hostile to their views of the Church and of its doctrines. But if they would look steadily at their own position, now rendered more manifest by the issue of the contest, they would feel that they are vainly trying to raise their Church to the standard of influence and power which their affections have devised. They would feel that they are only one

small section of it, tending to dissent from its essential principles. We can sympathize with their feelings, we can well conceive the painful disappointment which an ardent spirit must suffer, when having fixed its eagerest ambition upon the establishment of a favorite theory, it finds a clog upon its efforts in the very cause it has espoused. We can well imagine a youthful mind, after having lived, in spirit, amidst the heroes of ancient Christianity, after having studied, in the conduct of an Athanasius, how the Church may clothe her arm with thunder, when heresy assails her, after having satisfied himself that the Bible never was the rule of faith, but the Church its teacher,* try to apply in practice these lessons and convictions, and sigh to discover that the machinery is broken in pieces, and the springs all relaxed, which then seemed to act with such mighty force. We can conceive the inward regrets of one who has picked out, with beautiful skill, and woven into a golden chain, the few grains of poetic feeling which the torrent of the Reformation tore from the ancient Church, and has preserved in the dry and sandy desolation of its "Christian year;" upon seeing how much matter fit for a muse like his, has been indiscriminately and unfeelingly swept away, how much nobler and more moving themes he would have possessed, had that touch been gentler which broke off the flowers, when it pretended but to prune the plant.

* See the Arians of the Fourth Century, pp. 49 *et seq.*

But only let these ideas be indulged to the utmost; let those who reason, and those who feel upon religion, only boldly pursue their respective trains of thought unto their ends. Let them construct, in mind, "the Church which would realize their conceptions, the religion which would embody their ideas of perfection," and there can be little doubt what the result would be. They would pass from the dreams of theory to a reality which would satisfy their warmest longings, and fill up the measure of their just desires.

THE

HIGH CHURCH THEORY

OF

DOGMATICAL AUTHORITY.

(From the *Dublin Review* for July, 1837.)

ART. III.—1. *Primitive Tradition recognized in Holy Scripture;* a Sermon preached in the Cathedral Church of Winchester, at the Visitation of the Most Worshipful and Rev. W. Dealtry, D. D., Chancellor of the Diocese, Sept. 27, 1836. By the Rev. JOHN KEBLE, M. A. Second edition. London: Rivingtons. 1837.

2. *The British Critic*, No. XL. (Oct., 1836.)

IT is ever our desire to treat religious subjects with becoming seriousness; and to meet all controversial antagonists in a meek, and consequently in a courteous, spirit. There may be apparent exceptions to this rule. Sometimes the rudeness or effrontery of those who assail us is far more remarkable than their arguments; and it becomes our duty to disarm them of the advantages which these qualities unfortunately confer on men who appeal to public passion or vulgar prejudice. On other occasions they have endeavored to take an

unfair advantage, and thought to disgust or terrify us from the field, by shaking before our eyes some Gorgon shape, which they affect to hold up as the likeness of our religion, instead of brandishing the keen and polished blade of honorable warfare. As in the first case duty has compelled us to deal with our adversaries as a knight of old would have done with a churl that assailed him with base, ungentle weapons, so have we in the second acted as he would have done with a necromancer that sought to prevail by philtres and poisoned charms; and in either case have made our onslaught, without admitting our opponents to participation in the rights of controversial chivalry.

But there are others whom, though engaged on the same side, we would not willingly treat in like manner. If the conventional law of such lists as we now enter allow us not to lift up our vizors, and declare who we are; if the cognizance which we at present bear be that of an order of our religious community, rather than of an individual; not the less do we claim credit for personal sincerity when we say that we take the field without a particle of any feeling that could cloud the purity of devotion to the truth. We have no desire of any triumph over *the men* whose principles we are about to examine—we shall regret if a word escape us that could reach their feelings with pain; and we shall even endeavor to harden our own against the ruffling impressions which allusions, phrases, and charges, wherein they occasionally indulge, are apt to make upon them.

That a sermon delivered on a solemn occasion by a distinguished clergyman of the Anglican Church on "primitive tradition" should excite our attention, and call forth our remarks, will not be matter of surprise. But we may be asked, upon what grounds we unite it, in a common article, with the miscellaneous contents of a critical journal? Though we might plead the privilege of our caste, as reviewers, to have no law but our good will for heading our articles, we waive this plea, and are willing to descend to an explanation of our motives. We have ourselves been too lately sinned against by the unwarrantable attribution of our articles to individuals, who have been made responsible for their contents,* not to be anxious

* Dr. Whittaker, for instance, has thought proper to make Dr. Wiseman responsible for an article on Catholic Versions of Scripture in our second number. "I cannot pretend to follow you," he says, addressing this gentleman, "through the account which you have thought proper to give in your second Lecture, and in the last (second) number of the *Dublin Review*, of the Versions of Scripture." (A series of Letters to the Rev. N. Wiseman, D. D., Letter II. p. 170.) After analyzing the statements of this article regarding one or two versions, he draws from them conclusions intended to be ruinous to Dr. Wiseman's character as a scholar. "The specimens which I have given are quite sufficient to fix your character for ever as a man of patient and faithful research" (p. 179). "In the account which you have given of Brucioli's bible, there is not one particle of truth, with the exception of the date of the *editio princeps*. I am convinced you never saw the book, etc. This is not a scholar-like mode of proceeding; and for myself, I can only say that after this specimen of your biblical researches, I would

to avoid a similar injustice with regard to others. We do not intend to consider Mr. Keble as personally concerned in the opinions which we may quote from the 40th number of the *British Critic*, though we do not suppose that we shall make a single extract from it that he would disavow. But this being the organ of the Church party to which

not trust to your accuracy in any one particular, without references to the original authorities" (p. 175). "You will, however, permit me to remark, that, after having detected your very remarkable (not to say singular and somewhat extraordinary) dealing with Brucioli's version, I do not exactly see what right you have to speak disrespectfully of Mr. H. Horne." (Here follows a quotation from Dr. Wiseman's acknowledged Lectures.) "Truly, Sir, I think you may apply your own petulant censure of Mr. Horne to yourself with abundant propriety" (p. 180). All these solemn and uncourteous charges want only one ingredient to make them really serious—they are totally destitute of their necessary foundation. Dr. Whittaker did not think it necessary to ascertain whether Dr. Wiseman was the author of the paper so unmercifully censured. As the Rev. gentleman is more than 1,000 miles from the scene of accusation, and may not think it worth while to confute Dr. Whittaker's voluminous letters in a separate form, we beg to declare that he was not the author of that paper, nor of any part thereof, and that he is noways answerable for its contents. Not that we mean by this removal of responsibility to admit the accuracy of the Rev. vicar's conclusions, or of his charges against the author of the paper, whoever he may be; but we feel it a duty to oppose this disingenuous and "unscholarlike" conduct of attempting to ruin a clergyman's character for accuracy, by falsely assuming what first required proof—his being the author of what is impugned. This specimen may be perhaps "sufficient to fix Dr. Whittaker's character forever as a man of *candid* and faithful research."

he conspicuously belongs, we think it will be in our power to illustrate the doctrines, and correct the statements, which his interesting discourse contains, through the fuller developments to be found in the article referred to.

The article in the Review, which we have specially in our eye, is the sixth, headed, "Dr. Wiseman's Lectures on the Catholic Church." These Lectures have been examined with more or less severity in various publications; and, should it be the author's intention to reply systematically to them all, we may appear to step in between him and his just quarrel, by prematurely singling this criticism for our present observations. Such, however, is not our intention. We mean not to attack its contents, as Dr. Wiseman's champions, but only to discuss it as a manifesto of the principles, and a vindication of the claims, maintained by the party that consider themselves the true upholders and representatives of the English Church. And as the method by them pursued involves necessarily a manifold charge of misrepresentation against the author whom they review, we flatter ourselves that we may justly step somewhat aside to vindicate his character, whenever that of our religion shall seem assailed through his side.

The fearless and uncompromising revival of High Church principles by a small body of youthful, learned, and as far as we have opportunity of knowing, amiable clergymen, in the face of much unpopular feeling, of great alienation from their

brethren, and of little encouragement from their superiors, does credit to their sincerity and to their zeal. They have placed themselves in a prominent position, and in the post of honorable danger. They have endeavored to throw outworks beyond the acknowledged precincts of their Church's walls, to protest against the encroaching lines of dissent; and they have manned them, we think in forlorn hope, determined to keep the pressure of the attack at a greater distance. We indeed, on our side, complain, and their more immediate adversaries—their rebels as they consider them—agree, that they have seized, for this purpose, a territory, not their own, but of our legitimate possession. They disclaim the charge, and affirm that they stand in a middle position—between "Romanism," as they choose to call it, and dissent. But, when they speak thus, it is not as a school, or a party; they boldly profess to declare the real sentiments of their Church, "the Anglican," as they style it, considering it a part of the Catholic, or universal, Church of Christ dispersed over the world. Of this Church, "the Roman" is acknowledged to be a part, though they think it has not preserved purity of doctrine. But we must specify more in detail the principles of this school, and we trust we shall be found to do so with perfect impartiality.

First, then, "in the sense in which it is commonly understood at this day, Scripture is not, on Anglican principles, the Rule of Faith." * It is,

* British Critic, p. 388.

however, "its only standard, test, or depository."* There is, consequently, "a guide, though not an infallible one, but subordinate to Scripture. English theology considers that Scripture is not an easy book, and, as so considering, believes that Almighty God has been pleased to provide a guide. The twentieth article declares that the Church 'hath authority in controversies of faith.'"†

Secondly, "the English doctrine does not encourage private judgment in matters of (necessary) faith, but maintains the Church's authority."‡ In this respect the Anglican doctrine is "as distinct from Catholicism§ as from common Protestantism. The Catholic gives to the existing *Church* the ultimate infallible decision in matters of saving faith; the Ultra-Protestant to the *individual*; and the Anglican to *antiquity*, giving authority to the Church as being the witness and voice, or

* British Critic, p. 385. † P. 377. ‡ P. 378.

§ Where we write "Catholic" or its derivatives, the *Critic* has "Romanist" and "Romanism." It is evident that these terms are not used in scorn; but our ears are not accustomed to hear them employed in any other way, and we trust we shall be excused if we refuse to admit them, and decline every other appellation but our own, simply "*Catholics*." By this substitution we feel we are doing an act of justice to the *British Critic* and its party. For any of our readers who found in our extracts the term "*Romanists*," and had not read the entire article, would confound its writer with that common herd of Protestant controversialists, who think there is an argument in a nickname. We use the term "Anglican," because it is that adopted by the critic himself, when speaking of his own Church.

rather the very presence of antiquity among us."* The authority of the Church is, however, "subordinate to Scripture," inasmuch as she "may indeed pronounce doctrines as *true*, which are not in Scripture, so that they are not against it; but she may not declare points to be necessary to salvation, and act accordingly, unless she professes to derive them from Scripture. Her decision in such extra-scriptural matters is not secure from error; is entitled to veneration, but has not, strictly speaking, *authority*, and therefore may not rightly be *enforced*."† All this, nevertheless, is not to be understood of any particular Church, but gives as its results, "that the whole Church, all over the world, will never agree in teaching and enforcing what is not true."‡

Furthermore, the Church of England being an "independent apostolic Church, a branch of the Catholic Church of Christ,"§ she "claims the spiritual allegiance of the people, to the exclusion of *all rival claims*;" "the duty of communion with her is founded upon reasons derived from absolute religious obligation;" and hence we Catholics, "of these countries, are very justly charged with schism;"‖ while "Wesley was a heresiarch."¶

Such we believe to be an accurate summary of the doctrines maintained by the party whose organ is the *British Critic*, concerning the Rule of Faith. We have woven into our account the very

* British Critic, p. 384. † P. 379. ‡ P. 380.
§ P 434. ‖ P. 435. ¶ P. 402.

expressions of that journal, because it seems so excessively jealous of any mistake about its principles; and reproaches Dr. Wiseman repeatedly for drawing his ideas on the subject from authorities which its friends reject. Before, however, analyzing, as we intend, this scheme of Church authority, we must be allowed to dwell at some length upon Mr. Keble's sermon.

Its text is 2 Tim. i. 14,—"That good thing which was committed unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us." Before he closes with the real subject of his discourse, the Professor endeavors to establish a parallel between the circumstances of Timothy, when addressed in these words, and the clergy of the Anglican Church in these its calamitous times. He then divides his discourse into three parts, proposing these inquiries: *first*, What is the deposit or charge committed to Timothy; *secondly*, Are the English clergy at present partakers of it? *thirdly*, Have they the Holy Ghost dwelling in them for a faithful discharge of duty?

After some interesting remarks upon the word used for "deposit," in the text, and the probability of its being a conventional, ecclesiastical term, Mr. Keble concludes that the committed treasure consisted of *doctrine* (p. 17). This interpretation he further confirms by the testimonies of the ancient fathers. "Upon the whole," he concludes, "we may assume with some confidence, that the good thing left in Timothy's charge, thus absolutely to

be kept at all events, was the treasure of apostolical doctrines and Church rules; the rules and doctrines which made up the character of Christ's kingdom" (p. 20).

2. Is a similar deposit yet in the hands of Christian ministers? "Some," says Mr. Keble, "will reply to this question at once:—We have the Holy Scriptures, and we know for certain that they contain all that is important in Timothy's charge." He then asks, "Can this be proved? Must it not be owned on fair consideration, that Timothy's deposit did comprise matter independent and distinct from the truths which are directly scriptural?" (p. 21). In answer, we will give the preacher's own words, when he urges the reflection that the New Testament was not written at the date of this epistle:

"The holy writings themselves intimate that the persons to whom they were addressed were in possession of a body of truth and duty totally distinct from themselves, and independent of them. Timothy, for instance, a few verses after the text, is enjoined to take measures for the transmission, not of Holy Scripture, but of things which he had heard of St. Paul among many witnesses. The Thessalonians had been exhorted to hold the traditions which they had received, whether by word or apostolic letter."—P. 22.

Here follow other texts urged by Catholics, after which Mr. Keble proceeds as follows:—

"If the words, the commandments, the tradition which the latest of these holy writers severally commend in these and similar passages meant only or chiefly the Scriptures before written, would there not appear a more significant men-

tion of those Scriptures; something nearer to the tone of our own divines, when they are delivering precepts on the rule of faith? As it is, the phraseology of the Epistles exactly concurs with what we should be led to expect, that the Church would be already in possession of the substance of saving truth, in a sufficiently systematic form, by the sole teaching of the Apostles. As long as that teaching itself, or the accurate recollection of it remained in the world, it must have constituted a standard or measure of Christian knowledge, though it had never seemed good to the Almighty to confer on us the additional boon of the books of the New Testament."—P. 23.

The sentiments of the fathers are then appealed to, as confirmatory of this opinion. "Do they not employ Church tradition," asks Mr. Keble, "as parallel to Scripture, not as derived from it? and consequently as fixing the interpretation of disputed texts, not simply by the judgment of the Church, but by the authority of that Holy Spirit which inspires the oral teaching itself, of which such tradition is the record."* Again: "If we will be impartial, we cannot hide it from ourselves, that this *unwritten* word, if it can be anyhow authenticated, must necessarily demand the same reverence from us" (as the written must have done from the early Christians, when they ascertained it), "and for exactly the same reason—*because it is his word.*"†

But here the learned professor introduces a limitation, necessary to prevent a last step over

* Page 24.

† The words in *italics* throughout these quotations are so in the original.

the Rubicon of Protestantism. When the Scriptures were thus written, they were so written as to "contain every fundamental point of doctrine;" so that now "nothing is to be insisted on as a point of faith necessary to salvation, but what is contained in, or may be proved by, canonical Scripture."* This second part of the discourse then closes, by reducing to three classes the objects for which apostolical tradition is a rule. 1. "The systems and arrangement of fundamental articles;" 2. "Interpretation of Scripture;" and 3. "Discipline, formularies, and rites of the Church."

This outline will leave in our readers no room for astonishment, that Mr. Keble's sermon should have been openly charged with Catholicism, or "Romanism." Now, we declare that, to a very great extent, the charge is well-grounded. Strike out a few sentences, in which he tacks his theory to the Thirty-nine Articles, and the sermon might have been preached in St. Peter's at Rome. Whether these few passages neutralize the body of the discourse, we leave it to the members of his Church to decide. How far his opinions are ours, that is, Catholic, we have a right to judge; how far they are, at the same time, those of his professed religion, let others see. But, in the meantime, we will offer our remarks, to aid the passing of a rightful judgment.

Mr. Keble acknowledges that tradition preceded Scripture, and attested its canon (p. 28).

* Page 30.

The authority, too, of that tradition was divine; it was based upon the commission given to the apostles to teach, "He that heareth you heareth me" (p. 32). The tradition itself was God's "*unwritten* word." This authority, then, was paramount, for it had no co-ordinate: it was sole. Nay, more, it was all-sufficient; for it was the only "standard and measure of Christian knowledge." After a considerable lapse of time, according to the learned professor, "in the interval between Clement and Ignatius on the one hand, and Irenæus and Tertullian on the other; that is, after about TWO HUNDRED YEARS after Christ, "the canon of the New Testament had first become fixed and notorious;"* and then tradition lost its prerogatives, and Scripture became the sole standard. We ask on what authority the assertion rests, or how is its subsistence justified? Was the divine commission or authority withdrawn from the pastors, whose teaching, till now, had been the test or standard of truth? Had it been said, "He that heareth you, heareth me, till a New Testament be written, after which your delivering of a doctrine will cease to be a ground for believing?" A right clearly conferred, and not limited by, or made dependent on, contingent events, requires a plain abrogation before it ceases. Traditional, authoritative teaching, *was* clearly appointed; the substitution of Scripture *never* was;† how then can this have abrogated, or even limited the other?

* Page 30.

† See note E, p. 59.

But, further, Mr. Keble himself allows that "the all-sufficiency of Scripture is nowhere expressly affirmed in Scripture itself."* Where, then, *is* it affirmed? If in tradition, let it be shown. Let us have passages sufficient to verify the rule, *quod semper, quod ab omnibus, quod ubique*, declaratory that the Church despoiled herself, or considered herself despoiled, of that *complete* authority and *supreme* place which she had occupied in teaching truth, according to Mr. Keble's admission, previously to the decision of the Scriptural canon. If no such passages, either many or few, can be quoted, as we are sure they cannot, we have nowhere any limitation made to the first authority, nor any ground at all for the all-sufficiency of the Scripture in dogmatical teaching. Let us balance the admissions of this sermon—on the one hand, that originally, tradition, or a body of doctrines held in deposit by the Church, was the appointed and sufficient standard of faith, with a divine sanction—and on the other, that Scripture never claims all-sufficiency, or declares the cessation of the previous commission to teach; and we leave it to a candid reader to judge, whether the acknowledged rights of the earlier method of preserving truth can have been superseded by the introduction of the second. But if, as Mr. Keble intimates (p. 31), this substitution of Scripture for tradition, as the sufficient standard of dogma, is to be gathered from tradition itself; and if this doctrine of the Articles is to be

* Page 29.

considered matter of faith, or rather the foundation of all Protestant faith, then we have an instance of a point of faith "not contained in, nor proved by, canonical Scripture," but based upon tradition alone. In a word, we have the all-important assumption of Protestantism, that Catholics err by preserving to tradition its original virtue, made to rest upon this very tradition! For, we repeat it, it is acknowledged that, in Scripture, its own all-sufficiency is nowhere expressly declared.

We affirm, that the method pursued by the reverend professor in this part of his argument, will not bear a strict investigation. In fact, it is by inuendoes, assumptions, and surmises, rather than by close reasoning, that he attempts to engraft his Church's opinions concerning Scripture, as exclusively dogmatical authority, upon his theory of "primitive tradition." It is an ill-jointed piece of work: it is new wine in an old bottle, which can ill stand such fellowship. The following is the passage in which the task is performed; we note by *italics* the expressions to which we beg to direct attention.

"On the other hand, *it is no less evident*, that Scripture, being once ascertained, became, in its turn, a test for everything claiming to be of apostolical tradition. But on this part of the subject *there is less occasion to dwell, it being, I suppose, allowed on all hands.* . . . . The character which our article justly assigns to the Bible, of so 'containing all things necessary to salvation, that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of

any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.' This character the Bible could not, from the very force of the terms, acquire, until a sufficient portion of its contents had appeared, to include in one place or another, every one of such fundamentals. *Nor are we sure* of this condition having been fulfilled, until the appearance of St. John's gospel and epistle. This consideration *may serve to account* for the comparative rareness of quotations from the New Testament, in the writings of the first century."

Here follow some proofs of this scarcity, and of the appearance of more frequent appeals to Scripture in Tertullian and St. Irenæus; after wh'ch the author continues:—

"*From all this I gather*, that in the interval . . . . the canon of the New Testament had first been fixed and notorious, and that the fact had been observed which is stated in our article . . . . that every fundamental point of doctrine is contained in the unquestioned books of that canon, taken along with the Hebrew Scriptures. And this observation *being once made, would of course immediately suggest* that golden rule, not of the Anglican only, but of the Catholic Church, that nothing is to be insisted on as a point of faith, etc. *At any rate it is unquestionable*, that by the time of Irenæus, *i. e*, towards the end of the second century, the fact had been universally recognized, and the maxim thoroughly grounded and incorporated into the system of the Catholic Church."*—Pp. 28–31.

If the Church of England is willing that this should stand for its demonstration of its Article,

* In a note on this passage (F, p. 60), the author developes this appeal to St. Irenæus. First, he quotes a passage which speaks only of two ways of studying Scripture, but applies in no way to dogmatical teaching, or the grounds of faith. He then refers to the well-known passage of St. Irenæus,

on the exclusive dogmatic authority of Scripture, we heartily congratulate it on the state of its foundations. Let the argument be inculcated in church and school, let it be urged upon the laity, and recommended to the clergy; and we Catholics may fold our arms, and patiently wait its effects. Let it be preached in every Anglican congregation,

given by himself in the sermon (p. 24). St. Irenæus asks: "What if the Apostles had left us no Scripture?" etc.; upon which Professor Keble thus reasons: "The mere question, If we had not the Scriptures, must we not follow tradition? implies that, having the Scriptures, we have the substance of truth, necessary to salvation, and, so far, depend not at all on tradition." Perhaps it might have been so, had St. Irenæus shown that he meant to draw this consequence, and not exactly the contrary. For he puts the question in order to prove that it is "easy to receive truth *from the Church*,"—not from Scripture; and that, even in his time, "whoever willed might receive from her the waters of life, since therein, as in a rich depositary, the Apostles did most abundantly lodge all things appertaining to truth" (p. 24). Surely this does not prove that St. Irenæus imagined the Scripture to have impaired the Church's rights as the depositary of truth. It can hardly be considered fair to draw inferences from a writer's words, as though he had not himself done it; it can be still less fair to draw one exactly at variance from the one he draws. Nor, after all, could Mr. Keble's argument be, under any circumstances, correct, for St. Irenæus says nothing at all about "the substance of truth necessary to salvation;" and if his words proved the substitution of Scripture for Church authority, there is nothing to restrict them to this one object, but they would imply the complete abrogation of *all* traditional teaching, which it is not the professor's desire to admit. He had no right to introduce any such restriction, and the context gives no sanction to it. St. Irenæus is the only father whom he quotes.

that originally, for nearly two hundred years, the very rule of faith propounded by us was the only one, the Church being the sole depositary of truth, and tradition its only standard; and that these were fully guaranteed by divine sanction: but, that *we may gather*, from the growing abundance of scriptural quotation in writers of the second century, that a certain fact (which, be it remarked, is by them nowhere recorded or alluded to), had been observed, to wit, that Scripture contained all the essential doctrines of religion;—further, that *such an observation being made*,—of which there is no evidence,—*would of course suggest* the golden rule of the 20th Article;—finally, that the result would be a transfer of the dogmatical deposit from divinely sanctioned tradition to Scripture, which nowhere declares itself all-sufficient,—which transfer takes place about the time of St. Irenæus, though no ecclesiastical act or declaration, no historical record, no voice of attesting witnesses, has preserved a note of such an important revolution! Grant all this—grant our rule two centuries of undisturbed, authorized possession, and then we may safely allow such a tissue of unsupported assumptions and conjectures to deprive it of its rights—if they can!*

* [Let us suppose that a writer on Roman jurisprudence were to assert that the application of this science was based upon traditionary teaching until the Theodosian code incorporated the traditions in a written system, we should naturally expect that this would be proved by the laws themselves

With the third division of Professor Keble's sermon we deal not, at present; nor do we know that we shall ever revert to it. Whether it is right or not in the ministers of the Anglican Church to consider themselves gifted with the Holy Ghost, and with a grace "altogether supernatural" (p. 43), is indeed a solemn consideration, pregnant, to them and their flocks, with awful results. If they have always believed themselves so divinely aided, we suppose they must always have taught their subjects to reverence their words, as became their high calling. But then we would ask, if the imposition of hands, which is an "outward and visible sign," confers a grace distinct from "the preventing or assisting grace common to all Christian persons" (p. 43), is it not a sacrament according to the definition of the Anglican Catechism? For Mr. Keble and his friends will not deny Christ's institution, upon the supposition of which their entire argument respecting Church authority rests. Yet it will not be said that their Church has ever taught Order to be a sacrament. Either their theory leads to contradiction of the doctrine usually,

or by competent authorities. There would be a line of demarcation between the practical application of the two systems. Now would Mr. Keble show that the Fathers, in dealing with errors, act on two principles before, and after, the supposed recognition of Scripture? Would it not be a new and startling theory to Protestants that the Catholic rule and practice as to dogma existed alone for two centuries, and that then (no one knows how) the Anglican intervened, and expelled it?]

or rather universally, taught in their church respecting the binary number of the sacraments, or else the definition which it gives excludes Order from the number; in which case, as the outward sign certainly exists, either the inward grace or the divine institution must be wanting. Now, the absence of either is fatal to Mr. Keble's doctrine, as applied to his Church or her ministers.

It is time now for us to return to the declarations of the *British Critic*. What we have said, however, of Mr. Keble's sermon must not be considered entirely a digression. We have treated the subject of tradition somewhat at length, because the correctness or the inconsistency of the High Church party's opinions concerning it must materially affect their theory of Church authority. If they can establish what the reverend professor desires, a middle view between the Bible alone, in each man's hands, and a deposit of dogmatical truth, distinct from it, yet enduring in the Church, as the real Anglican doctrine, they will have some chance of success in proving the existence of a middle state between individual judgments and infallible definitions, and between the anarchy of sectarianism and the universal unity of Catholicism.

In looking over the theory of Church authority, set forth in the passages which, higher up, we wove together from the *British Critic*, and which indeed on many other occasions are proclaimed by that journal and its friends, two things particu-

larly strike us; *first*, the attempt which they make to palm their peculiar and unauthorized sentiments upon the Anglican Church; and *secondly*, the utter inconsistency and fallacy of the scheme of Church authority which they claim in its behalf. We will offer a few obvious remarks upon these two points.

I. A great portion of the article to which we principally call attention is taken up with an attempt to prove that Dr. Wiseman has been unjust towards the English Church, by confounding her principles respecting the Bible and the rule of faith, with those maintained by all other Protestants. He is charged with "misunderstanding its doctrine;" and the reviewer is "indeed surprised that so well-read a man should not have recollected more of the divinity of Anglican standard authors, than to assert that the fundamental principle of Protestantism, as *recognized in the English Church*, is 'that the Word of God alone is the true standard of faith.'"* This is but one passage out of many wherein the same reproach is uttered.

Before the present inquiry can be satisfactorily solved, it is necessary to have some criterion by which the avowed principles of a religion can be known, in contradistinction to the opinions tolerated within its pale. Now we apprehend that the fairest and surest test is universality of consent, or diversity of opinion, in teaching, concern-

* Page 384.

ing it. If the symbolical documents of a Church that is, its avowed definitions, or authorized expositions, of faith, decide, or seem to decide, a belief, and the great body of its pastors or teachers agree in one interpretation of that definition, and allow none other to be taught, that we hold to be the doctrine of that Church. If it allow two most different, or even contradictory, sentiments to be publicly taught, the holders of neither have a right to call theirs more than opinions *in* the Church. We can illustrate this rule either from the Catholic, or from the Anglican, Church.

The Catholic Church holds a dogma often proclaimed, that in defining matters of faith she is infallible. No one would be allowed by her to teach any other doctrine; whoever does, ceases practically to be a Catholic; and if he be a pastor, and prove obstinate in his error, must be removed from his office. At the same time, while all agree that this infallibility resides in the unanimous suffrage of the Church, whether united in council or dispersed over the world, the Italian doctrine extends it to the plenitude of authority residing in its head, and makes his dogmatical decrees of force antecedently to the expressed consent, or implied acquiescence, of the other pastors. The Gallican denies this, and maintains that time must be given for the Church to assent or dissent; and only in the case of assent considers the decree binding. Practically, as experience has proved, either opinion leads to the same results; but man-

ifestly the assertors of neither can demand that their peculiar theory be received by others, as the defined or acknowledged principle of the Church, neither think we that they could reasonably charge with "misunderstanding their *Church's doctrines*," such as would not so receive it. But let us take an example from the English Church.

Her 22nd article "at one fell swoop" pounces upon purgatory, indulgences, veneration of images and relics, and invocation of saints, and utterly condemns them all, most irremissibly. The 30th article asserts the use of the cup to be of equal importance, by divine institution, with the receiving of the other element in the Lord's Supper; the 28th, that transubstantiation is opposed to God's word. Few articles probably are subscribed with greater unanimity and heartiness, by churchmen, than these; never have we heard of a single bold spirit among them flying in the face of their letter, and presuming to deliver in church a word in favor of what these condemn. Were any one of them to preach on the existence of purgatory, or the right of administering the Eucharist under the form of bread alone, we have no doubt but his diocesan would soon reprove him, and, should he turn out obstinate, remove him from his situation. The contrary opinions then to these points are articles of belief *of* the Anglican Church, on which no difference of opinion is tolerated in any of her ministers. But take on the other hand justification, election, predestination and you will find

them, according as they belong to the evangelical or high-church "connection," holding and teaching the most conflicting doctrines to neighboring flocks, without being removed, or even chid for either set of opinions which they may have chosen to embrace. It is true that the former points are but as "mint and cummin" compared to these "weightier things of the law;" but it is no less true that the Church of England allows a latitude of doctrine respecting them, which forbids us to admit the holders of either opinion as exclusively in possession of its declared sentiments. In like manner, *supposing* that Church to have defined that it "hath authority in matters of faith," and yet to allow the public teaching of two opinions within its bosom, by its legitimate ministers, one to the extent of the *British Critic's* assertions, the other to the extent of a total denial of them; we must, even in charity as in good sense, refer this matter to those on which diversity of opinion is tolerated, and refuse to accept either as the doctrine of the Church. Each can pretend only to be a doctrine taught *within* it.

There are two ways of ascertaining this variety of opinions, upon this, as upon any other point; by the examination of its living teachers, and by the appeal to more ancient testimonies. We are willing to take either test.

And first, as to the state of opinion on this subject in the present Church, we have evidence within reach. We open once more Mr. Keble's

sermon, and see the following dedication:—"To the worshipful and Rev. W. Dealtry, D.D., Chancellor of the Diocese of Winton, and to the Reverend the Clergy of the Deaneries meeting at Winchester, this sermon is respectfully inscribed, *having been preached before them, and being now published in deference to their expressed wish, of examining at their leisure the statements therein contained.*" Surely had the learned professor preached only what the Church of England avowedly teaches, and what its clergy have received as her doctrines; had there been nothing *new*, or at least *uncommon* in the "statements" of his sermon, a body of dignified clergymen would not have expressed a wish to see them in print, that they might examine them at their leisure. Had he preached a tirade against "image worship," or such anticatholic statements as form the charges of a Burgess or a Philpotts, we hardly fancy that such leisurely examination, such a subjection of the sermon to the scrutiny of the "faithful eyes," would have been deemed necessary. *We* could not conceive such a demand to be made by the assembled clergy of one of our dioceses, if the preacher had only delivered the acknowledged doctrines of our Church.

These suspicions have been more than strengthened by the reception of the discourse itself among many members of the Church. The Rev. Arthur T. Russell, of St. John's, Cambridge, and Vicar of Caxton, hesitates not to call it "*an heterogeneous*

mixture of popery and protestantism; as inconsistent with the existence of the latter, as were the errors against which St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans and Galatians were written, inconsistent with the profession of Christianity."* This probably is an extreme opinion; and, therefore, between it and the approval of the professor's theory as sound Anglicanism, there are innumerable degrees of reproof, harsher and milder, which the sermon has undergone. Mr. Russell, a little later, upon quoting Mr. Keble's argument in favor of tradition, "because it is God's (unwritten) word," remarks, This is the very form in which the Romanist puts his argument for the equal authority of tradition in the Scripture. True, it may be replied, but Professor Keble rejects Romanist tradition. I ask not what kind of traditions he rejects; but *if any traditions are to be revered as the unwritten word of God, the principle* is conceded to the Romanists, let the application of the principle in points of detail be what it may."† Surely it would be discreditable to the Church itself to admit that upon matters of faith, graduates of the two Universities could differ so widely in opinion; though, to speak the truth, we can hardly comprehend, in any manner, so vague a system of doctrine, that a Master of Arts of Oxford should uphold, as defined by a Church article, what a Bachelor of Laws of

* Remarks on the Rev. Professor Keble's Visitation sermon, etc., Cambridge, 1837, p. 5.

† Page 7.

Cambridge should denounce as "inconsistent with the profession of Christianity."

Be this as it may, it is clear that *the Church* does not receive the doctrines of the High Churchmen as part of its defined code. And in fact what we alleged in our first number upon the Hampden case, and in what we quoted in our third, from Dr. Maude, Mr. Bickersteth, and others, goes towards establishing the same point. Indeed the Hampden case, we think, proved the Oxford divines to be only a minority in the Church. But wherefore any need of proof, when, to use the *Critic's* expression, we have *confitentem reum?* In p. 384, he finds it necessary to explain his denial that the Bible alone is admitted by the Anglican Church as the rule of faith. "Now let us understand here," so he writes, "we know full well that this is a popular mode of speaking at this day; we know well it is an opinion *in* our Church; but it is by no means universally received, much less a principle. And Dr Wiseman, as a *well-read* divine, ought to recollect this." This reserve and caution of expression, for which we give that journal sincere credit; this serious protestation that the opinion contrary to its own is *not* universal; this acknowledgment that nevertheless it is "popular" is more than sufficient to prove that its own theory is not that of the Church, but one among conflicting systems permitted to live and contend yet nestle together in her easy bosom.

But the writer in the *British Critic* enforces his charge against Dr. Wiseman by an appeal to existing facts. He asks if the assertions it has combated can be "truly, nay fairly," made, not "by a well-read divine, but by an intelligent observer of the English Church for the last twenty years? Is Dr. W. a stranger to the continual and violent charges brought against far the larger portion of the Church, of its making the Prayer-book 'a safeguard' to the Bible? Has not the body of the Church opposed the Bible Society on this ground?" (p. 385). These questions regard us as much as Dr. Wiseman, and therefore we may answer them. To the first we reply that we Catholics should feel rather ashamed of any advocate who advanced no better proof that *our Church* held the doctrine of authority, than that she had a missal and a breviary, as well as a Bible. Even conjointly with others, we should consider such an argument equivalent to a betrayal of the cause. But, if making a prayer-book a safeguard to the Bible prove the maintenance of Church authority, it can only prove it in favor of that "larger portion" who make it such, and not of the Church, which equally owns the smaller portion (*if* smaller) who do not; nor can Dr. W. be charged with injustice for not drawing his conclusions from a part to the whole.

But to the second query we reply, that at first it startled and astonished us. Our memory we feared might be treacherous, so we turned over

the pages of the Bible Society Reports to refresh it, and we found as follows: The society was established in 1805, and its first report gives us as Vice-Presidents, the Lords Bishops of London, Durham, Exeter and St. David's, with four laymen. In 1808 the Archbishop of Cashel is added to their number. The following year is remarkable for the establishment of Auxiliary Societies, the first being under the patronage of the Bishop of Salisbury.* In 1810 the list of Vice-Presidents includes the following: Archbishop of Cashel, Bishops of Durham, Salisbury, St. David's, Bristol, Cloyne and Clogher. The Bishop of Bristol placed himself at the head of a branch society, and recommended the institute by a circular letter to his clergy. Moreover, the Committee record, with great pleasure, a donation of fifty guineas, unanimously voted by the same Bishop, the Master and the Seniors of Trinity College, Cambridge.† In 1813, we find among the Vice-Presidents, one Archbishop, ten Bishops, English and Irish, and the Dean of Westminster. In 1816, the number of Bishops had increased to twelve, with two Deans. All this showed the steady increase of patronage from the high places of the Church. But perhaps the opposition from the body of the Church began later. Passing over, at once, to the latest report within our reach, that of 1835, we find still enumerated at the head of the

* Report for 1809, p. 220.
† Sixth Report, pp. 296, 306.

Vice-Presidents, the Archbishop of Tuam, the Bishops of Winchester, Salisbury, Norwich, Lichfield, Chester, Kildare, Sodor and Man, Calcutta and Madras and the Deans of Bristol and Salisbury. And glancing over the names of subscribers, we find that of the Most Rev. Dr. Howley, Archbishop of Canterbury. Moreover, upon collating the reports for half the duration of this society, we have ascertained that *fourteen* dioceses of England and Wales have been represented by their bishops and *two* others by their deans, in the council of vice-presidents, who receive an annual vote of thanks for their *patronage*. If, then, Churchmen are to decide the maintenance or the rejection of the principle of authority, by the countenance or opposition shown by their superiors to the Bible Society, to what conclusion must they come? This generation must conclude, that in almost every part of England, they have been practically encouraged and exhorted, by the representatives of their Church, to support the Society, whose avowed object is "the circulation of Scripture without note or comment." And yet the claim to authority is to be deduced from exactly the contrary supposition!

After these two bold attacks in form of questions, the *Critic* makes "a thrust in tierce," which we think we can as easily parry before it reach Dr. Wiseman's side. It is as follows:—"Nay, to go higher, do we not read in our service, the Athanasian Creed, which, whether it allows private

judgment or not, clearly propounds that *unless private judgment terminate in the reception of certain most definite statements of doctrine, it incurs the Church's direct and absolute anathema?* Considering the assaults conducted by individuals on this creed; considering the continued struggle against what is sometimes called the High Church party, for a series of years past, *on the ground of its enforcing one certain interpretation of the Word of God*, under what impression, or in what state of mind, does Dr. Wiseman take for granted that the English Church consigns the Bible to each individual, and bids him draw his faith thence?"*

The plain meaning of which is—"Display as much erudition as you please upon texts of Scripture; but recollect that you have a certain dogma to maintain, and that your erudition must finally, by some means or other, appear to establish it. Now I would ask any one who feels the importance of religious truth, what kind of confidence can be placed in those who, on such principles, engage in the interpretation of the Word of God?" Reader, this commentary is not ours; it is from the pen of the Rev. Dr. Turton, Regius Professor of Theology at Cambridge, and is intended as a severe rebuke upon an assertion of the same Dr. Wiseman, that the biblical researches of the Catholic must give results conformable to the defini-

* *British Critic*, p. 385.

tions of the Church.* This he seems to consider as a monstrous ultra-popish idea; his commentary on which he reserved for his *bonne-bouche*, at the end of his book, as likely to startle good Protestants. Now, therefore, stripping his remarks of that personality with which the learned Doctor so abounds, we beg to place them as a target before Dr. Wiseman's breast. We cannot suppose that Oxford will reason with him on a principle as its own, which Cambridge denounces in him, as erroneous. Nay, he never went so far as to speak about "incurring the Church's direct and absolute anathemas."

We may, perhaps, be reproached by our readers, for extending this argument to such a length; if so, they must kindly bear with us a few moments more, while we discuss the appeal made from living witnesses to the illustrious dead. The *British Critic* indeed discards the Hornes, the Tottenhams and others; but it refers the question of Church authority to the Bulls, the Beveridges, the Lauds, the Jewels and a few other ancient divines. They, at least, prove by their testimony that the Church maintains its claim to dogmatical authority. It takes the trouble of making considerable extracts from their works.

We do not deny that on many occasions they seem to speak a language eminently Catholic; but we say no less, that they stood in their generation

* "The Roman Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist considered." Cambridge, 1837, p. 337.

as the Oxford knot do at present, as men of one way of thinking, amidst as many or more who maintained a different or even contradictory opinion. Laud was considered by many in the Church as little better than "a papist," and was suspected, whether truly we do not pretend to say, of hankering after the institutions, and dallying with the proffered dignities, of the Roman Church. Certain it is, that upon the episcopal bench of his time were found some to treat with the papal agents about a reconciliation with the Holy See.* Many other Anglican divines, the fear of the "Geneva discipline," and Presbyterian or Socinian opinions, drove to take shelter in tradition, and to claim rights for their Church, upon the authority of antiquity. At any rate, before we can admit these writers to be urged against us, as representatives of the true Anglican doctrine, we must be satisfied that the body of that Church considers them such. Of this we have as yet no proof. Furthermore, before we can allow that their opinions were the same as those held by the *Critic*, we must have some clearer evidence than its extracts. For we find Mr. Keble's antagonist stoutly asserting, and by quotations endeavoring to establish, that the Rev. Professor's doctrine is opposed to the sentiments of these very divines. For this purpose, he cites Jewel, Archbishop Sandys, Dr. Willet, Whitaker, Davenant, Bishop of Salisbury, Prideaux, Taylor, Allestree, and others.

* As Bishop Montague.

Let Anglicans themselves clear up these points, and decide—first, *who* are their acknowledged theological authorities, and then *what* these teach, and we may allow them to charge us with unfairness for not drawing our statements exclusively from them. The *British Critic* is, indeed, hard to please upon these matters. If Dr. Wiseman quotes Baxter, who has received the commendations of Barrow Wilkins, and other Anglican divines, or Jones, whom Dr. Maltby has praised,* it is an insult to Beveridge to place him in such company (p. 392). If Dr. Beveridge himself is cited, it happens to be a work written by him when a young man, and not published by himself (p. 390). As to the latter circumstance, people very seldom *do* publish their own "private thoughts," but rather leave them to be given after their deaths; and as to the first, we might allow the plea in matters of research or thought, but scarcely in treating of an acquaintance with the principle of faith held in one's own Church. Certes, St. Thomas Aquinas was not much, if at all, older when he composed many of his treatises; nor do we think that either Catholic or Protestant looks to the chronology of his works, when he quotes him as a testimony of what his Church teaches, and taught. And surely, that cannot be very clearly the principle of faith of the Anglican Church, which Bev-

* The Clarendon press, at which Jones's work was printed, is under the direction of persons appointed by the vice-chancellor of Oxford University.

eridge, about to take orders, did not know to be such, and only discovered by maturer studies.

We have various other remarks connected with this topic, which we must pass over at present. In concluding this subject, we will observe that perhaps the reviewer may have some small right to complain of Dr. Wiseman, for not having made, in his Lectures, an exception in favor of the party to which he and his friends belong. But to blame him for not separating *the Church* of England from other Protestants, in his arguments on the Rule of Faith, is manifestly unreasonable. Let that Church, *as a Church*, detach itself from all other sectaries in its reasoning against us, let it avow disapprobation of their principles, let it be as unanimous in its doctrines concerning tradition and Church authority—we will not say as we are, but as it is itself on the rejection of Transubstantiation—and then we will acknowledge its right to record a separate plea from the great body of Protestants, when the Catholic arraigns them together for a breach of religious unity.

Further, we will observe, that it is hard to make such a charge of injustice at this time of day. From Baily's * to Milner's "End of Religious Controversy," from Jewel's "Apology" to Burgess's "Charges," we meet no traces of this distinction between Anglican and Ultra-Protestant. The line of demarcation is clear and bold; "the

* An End to Controversy. Doway, 1654

Bible alone" on one side, "church authority" on the other, defines the challenge of the combatants; the Protestant never haggles about the terms, the Catholic never flinches from his ground. "With this sword" (Scripture), says Jewel, "did Christ put off the devil, when he was tempted of him; with these weapons ought all presumption which doth advance itself against God to be overthrown and conquered. 'For all Scripture,' saith St. Paul, 'that cometh by the inspiration of God, is profitable,' etc. Thus did the Holy Fathers always fight against the heretics, with none other force than with the holy Scriptures."* Harding understands these words in the usual "popular" sense of the rejection of all *authority* but of Scripture, and refutes them accordingly. Nor if we remember right, does Jewel complain of misrepresentation. If he appeals to the Fathers, it is more as a question of fact than of right; he wishes to show that they are with Protestants, and not with Catholics; but he does not admit them as judges or umpires between the two.

But after all, religion is a practical, and not merely a speculative, institution; and we think

* On the contrary, Professor Keble writes as follows:—"As often as Tertullian and Irenæus have false teachers to reprove, or unevangelical corruptions to expose, do they not refer to the traditions of the whole Church, as to something independent of the written word, and sufficient, at that time, to confute heresy, even alone? Do they not employ Church tradition as parallel to Scripture, not as derived from it?"—Sermon, p. 23.

that the doctrines of a Church may best be learned from what its pastors generally teach, and its followers generally believe. And on this view, we are satisfied that the Church of England, as it exists at present, must be enumerated under the general head of Protestantism, and cannot be placed in a distinct class. But its article which declares that "the Church hath authority in matters of faith:" to it we oppose, *first*, the doubtfulness of its authenticity, or rather the strong probability of its spuriousness, whereof *we* are nearly convinced. *Secondly*, the latitude of interpretation which we have already seen permitted in the Church, and which allows the Ultra-Protestant principle of private judgment to be publicly taught by its authorized ministers. *Thirdly*, the difficulties of the system to which it leads, as explained by the *British Critic*—difficulties which will not allow dogmatical authority to be the principle of the Anglican Church.

II. This last objection forms, if our readers remember, the second head of our general animadversions upon the system presented by the periodical organ of the High Church party. Our first exception to it arises from its evident obscurity, in the mind of its expositor himself. Take the two following passages:—

"Will he (Dr. W.) reply, that the Roman Church does *not* grant that it can decree things *contrary* to Scripture? True, but it claims to decree points of faith *beyond* Scripture. And this is the authority which we deny it."—P. 378.

* * * * * *

"We consider that her [the Church's] decision in such extra-scriptural matters is not secure from error; is entitled, indeed, to veneration, but has not, strictly speaking, *authority*, and therefore may not rightly be *enforced*. This distinction is made at the end of the twentieth Article:—'As it [the Church] ought not to *decree* anything against the same, so *besides* the same ought it not to *enforce* anything to be believed for necessity of salvation.' The Church must not enforce beyond Scripture; *it may decree*, i. e., *pronounce, beyond it, but not against it*."—P. 379.

And yet in the same breath we have been told that this is the very authority which is denied to the Catholic Church. The writer would, perhaps, reply, that it is the *authority* which is denied to us, and is not claimed by the Anglican Church. But, to a simple, unsophisticated reader, such a distinction will hardly occur; and we confess that we read over the paragraph repeatedly, with the conviction that its termination flatly contradicted its beginning. And even now it leaves upon our mind the conviction that the writer has not very clear notions of what he should deny to the Catholic Church, and what he should claim for his own.

Nor is this perplexity imaginary. The Church may *decree*, but it may not *enforce*. What if its decrees be disregarded? What, if men, as did the Presbyterians under Elizabeth and James, overlooking the distinction, pronounce that to be contrary to Scripture which the Church decrees as only beyond it? Must it stop short? Is it powerless in *enforcing* the observance of its injunctions? If so, then is that reasoning not unjust, of

which the *Critic* so loudly complains, that "each one has to judge for himself, whether the Church be contradicting the express doctrines of Scripture; and that, consequently, each person is thus constituted judge over the decisions of his Church."* Has the Church the right of enforcing upon the individuals? Then is the *Critic's* distinction futile and vain.

In fact, the idea of a Church, or any other governing authority, possessed of a power to *decree* more extensive than its power to *enforce*, is self-repugnant. It may *recommend* or exhort to an extent beyond its authority to put in execution, but it must not talk of enacting or *decreeing*.

This obscurity of the system may be further evinced from the heaviness of the commentary which overloads the simplicity of the text. The article, if genuine, simply says that "the Church hath authority in controversies of faith." This is vague enough, heaven knows; and gives little scope for practical inferences, but abundant for theories. Professor Keble engrafts upon it all his doctrine of tradition, and the threefold order of truths to be derived from it, and the necessity of studying diligently the writings of the Fathers. The *British Critic* builds upon it a more massive theory of the Anglican Church's referring "the ultimate infallible decision in matters of saving faith to antiquity, giving authority to the Church, as being the witness and voice, or rather the very

* Dr. Wiseman's Lectures on the principal Doctrines, etc. vol. I. p. 37.

presence of antiquity amongst us" (p. 384). This "limitation," or rather amplification, of the article, is to be drawn from one of the canons of convocation (p. 379). Be it so; but the canon would have done well to tell us, when, where, and by whom this appeal to antiquity, or rather this summons of attention to its yet speaking voice, is to be made: the *Critic* might have shown us how the Church makes it at the present day, in order to the confutation and overthrow of those rampant errors which have long torn her in pieces.

For this we think a still weightier objection to the system, that it is theory, and nothing but theory. It has no life, no vigor, no active existence. We may weary our readers by insisting so often upon this idea; but it is one never to be lost sight of, in controversy with this party. The Church which they describe, and which they idolize, is imaginary, and exists only upon paper. Perhaps in its beginning it may have exhibited its vital powers, by stoutly combating, and, with the aid of the secular arm, repressing, the innovations of seceders from its pale; but long has it given proof that such a vigor was external and adventitious, depending upon the interest which the State felt in its exercise of influence. Since it has been left to itself, although within it and around it, through dissent and dissension, its Articles have been impugned, its discipline decried, its usefulness disputed, its ministrations contemned; no voice of authority has been raised

within it, no outstretching of its arm has been witnessed; never once has it assumed that attribute of dignity, that imposing mien of command, which the imagined depositary of an apostolic teaching, and an establishment of heaven-guided ministers, might be supposed entitled to assume.

Has it been so with the Catholic Church? Was Jansenism, not half so perilous or so pernicious as Arianism, allowed by wily arts to seduce the faithful, while no one spoke? On the contrary, although but little more than a century before the Church had lost a large portion of her dominion, through the unhappy Reformation, and she seemed ill able to afford another defection, she did not hesitate to trace out the hidden error, and cut away, with steady hand, the cancer which had stretched its subtle roots through a part of her otherwise healthy frame. It was an operation, indeed, more painful and more difficult than the previous cutting off of a useless and diseased limb; but she shrank not from the performance of her stern duty. Though the sectaries were anxious not to break communion with the Universal Church, though they successively retreated from plea to plea, the Holy See, supported by the bishops of the Catholic world, tore off every disguise under which they sought to lurk, and overthrew every pretence for resistance, till the evil was removed, and, without loss to the Church, clean destroyed. When attempts were made by Ricci and the Pistojans to revive in Italy what

had been foiled in France, Pius VI., by his noble constitution *Auctorem Fidei*, vindicated the dignity of the Apostolic See, and united the suffrages of the whole Church in their condemnation. And that condemnation was the destruction of the dangerous novelty.

Such are, indeed, practical and vigorous proofs, not merely of a system of authoritative teaching in the Church, but of its healthy action. And such was the method pursued in that antiquity, which we are told yet raises its voice in the Anglican Church. For it was not then deemed sufficient to frame a symbol or code of articles, and then leave it to its fate, and pursue the detection and repression of error no further: but every new heresy was met by a new remedy, every poisonous invention led to the publication of a new antidote; and singly was each starting error beaten down, and in general effectually. Nay, the symbols of the Church were never mere "articles for the avoiding of diversities of opinion;" they were not acts for settling the basis of belief and government, but they were occasional exercises of authority called forth by the rise of new and unheard-of opinions. Even in the case of national churches, the same in a subordinate degree was their practice. The Donatists of Africa were energetically attacked and condemned, in the first instance, by the authoritative decisions of the Church in that country. If, then, Anglicanism holds the same principles, why does it not, as well

as Catholicism, continue to act upon the same system? God knows that it cannot have been from want of opportunity or necessity. Authority is an active instrument; it requires exercise for its maintenance; it is as a bow, which, if for ages left unstrung, will snap whenever the attempt be made again to bend it. If the English Church have all along believed herself possessed of so rich a deposit as this apostolic power to teach, how will she answer for having folded it up in a napkin, and buried it so long in the earth? If not, whence has a new light burst upon her now, or upon some of her divines, and convinced them she has always possessed the treasure?

How comes it, too, that never in her Articles is allusion made to the manner of exercising this authority, or to the places or circumstances under which the exercise should be made? We should rejoice, indeed, by way of experiment, to see such a trial made as the *Critic* somewhere proposes, of an Anglican national synod. We should like to see the Church condemn Calvinistic and semi-Arian principles, and deprive all ministers who teach them; endeavor to introduce the practices commended in the Oxford "Tracts for the Times," order such a reformation as would restore the cathedral service to its original forms, binding the wealthy canons to residence, and cutting down pluralities; then openly denounce, with the *Critic*, Wesley as "a heresiarch," and consequently his followers as heretics, and boldly pronounce that

anathema of the Church which the *Review* now mutters, against such as believe and profess not, in accordance with the Athanasian Creed. Let all this, we say, be done by a national council of the Anglican Church: and let its decrees be based upon "primitive tradition, as well as Scripture, and her authority claimed as a rightful inheritance ever held by her since apostolic times;" and then we shall indeed see whether her own children will justify her wisdom, or whether the attempted blow will not be rather considered as the "telum imbelle sine ictu,"* of one who sinks in venerable dotage at the foot of his vanquished domestic altar.

But the practical inutility of this speculative system of authority is far from ending here. Whoever claims a right to control others, whether in judgment or in action, must offer at least some advantage in return. The Protestant has an obvious right to ask the ministers of the Anglican Church, "If I surrender my opinions and reasonings into your hands; if I abandon my conventicle, and embrace your formularies of worship, what certainty have I gained that I am securer of the truth than I was before?" Now the answer, if honest and explicit, should, according to the principles of the *British Critic*, be as follows:—"The Anglican Church is a part of the true Church; she is a national independent branch thereof. She pretends not, however, even collectively, to immu-

* Æneid ii. 544.

nity from error. For it is one of her articles, that 'as the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred,' and as 'also the Church of Rome hath erred . . . in matters of faith,'* so the Anglican, which pretends to no more infallibility than she allows to them, may err no less in matters of faith. But then this immense advantage will result from your joining the national Church, that though it, as a particular Church, may fail, and teach what is erroneous in faith, yet '*the whole Church all over the world* will never agree in teaching and enforcing what is not true.'"†

Now, we ask any unprejudiced mind, whether this is not like toying with men's consciences and good sense at once? In fact, we have not gone far enough in the concessions of this imaginary, but consistent, answer. For some Anglican divines hold the Church to be of a revolutionary character—not in the political, but in the scientific, sense of the word—movable, like the Jewish tabernacle, from one place to another; and England is allowed by them to have had her turn, and to be probably on the point of losing it. Thus writes Dr. Daubeny, though we cannot be sure that he is on the *Critic's* list of the orthodox, and whether we may not be charged, as Dr. Wiseman has been, with unfairness in presuming to quote him, as an authority in the Church, whose champion he stands forth.‡ "Though this Church, from the days of

* Art. xix. † *British Critic*, p. 380.

‡ Dr. Daubeny indeed attacks boldly the sin of schism in all who separate themselves from the law-established Church.

its first settlement, hath been passing from country to country, as the inhabitants of each became respectively unworthy of its longer continuance among them; yet for our comfort we are assured that the gates of hell shall not completely prevail against it. In one part of the world or another, it will be found to the end of time. How long it may be in the counsel of God to continue it in this country he only knows. But the present divided state of Christians, so much lamented by all sound members of the Church, together with that too general indifference for all religious opinions, which, under the fallacious term of *liberality of sentiment*, now prevails, holds out to us no very promising prospect."* Therefore, not only *may* the Anglican Church fail, but it is highly probable that it *will*. But what matters it to the individual, that the Church all over the world will not concur in teaching error, so long as in this circumstance he has no pledge that the particular branch of it,

But we find that in his concluding discourse he is anxious that each one should be guided to it by the use of his individual judgment exercised upon the Bible, which he puts into his readers' hands, that, like the Bereans, they may search and examine. He is anxious not "to lead them blindfold; on the contrary, he is desirous that they should see for themselves, and see clearly." (Guide to the Church, 1804, vol. i. p. 222.) This proves how little Anglican divines are any more aware than Dr. Wiseman, that their Church rejects the exercise of individual private judgment upon the Bible, as the guide in matters of faith.

* Ibid. p. 159.

which he is called upon to join, is secure from failure? Or what claim can the latter establish, by the proof of this universal security, to a particular confidence? Could men be compelled as a solemn duty to carry their disputes before any given court of judicature, upon the ground that all the courts throughout the world could not concur in an unjust decision? It is *personal* security, his *own* safety, that each one is bound to seek, in matters of faith; and to *exact* submission and obedience in judgment and deed, as a duty strictly binding where that equivalent professedly is not given, is not only tyrannical but contradictory.

The only way in which this duty of adhesion to an insecure Church, on the ground that the body, whereof it is a corruptible member, is itself incorruptible, can be justified, appears to be this: That the universal Church of Christ, being indefectible, every particular Church which *actually* forms a part of it must be considered safe; and thus the communion with the fallible becomes a participation in the universal security of the infallible. Such we suppose to be the reasoning of the reviewer, when he insists upon the Anglican Church's being a branch of the Catholic or universal Church. But where is the proof that the Church of England is in communion with any other Churches in the world, except its own colonies, and perhaps the Episcopalians of North America? It has no more to say to the Greek, or Armenian, or Syriac, Church, than it has to the

French or Italian. There is neither common belief nor common discipline to cement it into unity with them. There is no acknowledgment of communion, there is no interchange of friendly offices, there is no intercourse of epistolary communication. There is no sympathy in distress, no common joy in prosperity, no acquaintance with one another's state and feelings. Take, if it please you, Dr. Isaac Barrow's utopian "Discourse concerning the Unity of the Church," and apply his enumeration of the duties of this unity, and see if from them it can possibly result that the Anglican Church is in possession of a single link connecting it with the rest of Christ's Church. "If anywhere any heresy or bad doctrine should arise, all Christians should be ready to declare against it . . . . especially the *pastors of the churches* are obliged with one consent to oppose it . . . Thus did the bishops of several churches meet to suppress the heresy of Pope [*Paul?*] Samosatenus. This was the ground of most synods."* When has the Anglican Church joined any such confederacy with any other churches, for the suppression of error or infidelity?

"If any dissension or faction doth arise in any church, *other churches*, upon notice thereof, should yield their aid to quench and suppress it." Is there any church that would, under such circumstances, ask for aid from the Anglican, or accept its proffered assistance?

* Barrow's Works, Tillotson's ed. vol. i. p. 766.

"All Christians should be ready, when opportunity doth invite, to admit one another to conjunction in offices of piety and charity; in prayer, in *communion of the Eucharist*, etc. St. Polycarp being at Rome, did communicate with Pope Aniectus."* Where is the *Episcopal* church which would admit an English Protestant bishop to officiate at the altar, or participate in its Eucharist, knowing him to reject, as fond and superstitious, so much of its belief and practice?

"If dissension arise between divers churches, another may interpose to reconcile them; as did the Church of Carthage, between that of Rome and Alexandria. If any bishop were exceedingly negligent in the discharge of his office, to the common danger of truth and piety, his neighbor bishops might admonish him thereto; and if he should not reform, might deprive him of communion." Does the Anglican Church admit in "any neighbor bishops" this right of interference, or does she pretend to it herself, or has she ever thought of using it? Would she expose herself to the certain rebuff she would receive, upon endeavoring to interpose as a mediatrix, between any two foreign churches?

"In cases of doubt or difficulty one Church should have recourse to others for advice, and any Church should yield it." Is there any example, or any chance, of such confidence existing between the Anglican, and any other, Church?

* Page 767.

Such are pretty nearly his proofs of unity between different establishments supposed to form collectively "the Catholic Church;"* and, therefore, did we call Dr. Barrow's treatise utopian, because believing, as we suppose, his Church to be one of such establishments, he gravely proposes tests of her pretensions which can only exist in imagination, and must show her to have no pretensions to a real place in this universal community. The dissenter, then,—for we must be allowed to smile when the *Critic* or Dr. Barrow has the simplicity to call *us* schismatics,—the Dissenter is solemnly urged, under grievous peril of his soul, to join the Anglican Church, not because she is safe from error, but because the entire Church is, of which she forms a part. And if he calls for proofs that she *is* a part of the Universal Church, characteristics are proposed to him, as criterions of her claim, not one of which exists in her; or rather the absence of which proves that she is *not* in communion with this Universal Church wherever it is to be found. The unsuccessful tampering of old with the Greek Church, through Cyril Lucaris, will prove, to the scholar, that our commentary upon Dr. Barrow's text has good foundation.

But if a Dissenter, thus staggered, not to say shocked, at the boldness of the system which asked

* Be it remembered that the *Critic* approves of Dr. Barrow's conclusion drawn from this very treatise, that Catholics are to be considered as schismatics.—P. 434.

so much, and gave him in return so little, were desirous to look about him elsewhere for something of what is here described, he would not be long in discovering a Church, composed of many national churches, possessed individually of rights and liberties, and forming complete governing communities; but so cemented together in steadfast unity of faith and discipline, as to verify what Dr. Barrow has written of religious unity. In our Church, he would find in practice and in truth, what, spoken of the Anglican Church by one of her own divines, must sound as a cruel jest. The Churches of France and Ireland, of Italy and South America, of Germany and Syria, of Spain and Poland, of Belgium and Cochin China, are in full enjoyment of almost every characteristic* of religious unity which we have transcribed; the subjects of any one could communicate, the clergy could celebrate at the altar of any other among them. The pastors could meet as brethren, and sit at one council-board; they *do* consult one another in cases of difficulty; they assist and receive one another in distress, and sympathize with their respective sufferings.† But the sects or Churches that are not

* We, of course, except such acts of high jurisdiction as *no* Church nowadays could pretend to in respect of another; such as the deposition of bishops in another country, etc. Such extraordinary power is only vested in the sovereign pontiff. But would the Anglican, under any circumstance, allow the American bishops to interfere in England to such an extent?

† A beautiful example of this truly Catholic feeling has

within this pale—and the Anglican is one—have and can have no participation in these advantages of communion with them, nor do they affect any among themselves. The Patriarch of Constantinople, or the Synod of Moscow, would be greatly astonished if the Convocation consulted them about the Thirty-nine Articles, or if his Grace of Canterbury, travelling in their parts, should ask to read the communion service in one of their churches.

But we are not sure that we should make the insecurity, of such as obey the Church of England's summons to join her, end here. For even this imaginary connection, which she cannot prove, with the Universal Church, ought, according to her principles, to be no guaranty. In her twenty-first article, she says, that "general councils," that is, assemblies of the bishops of the *whole* Church, "forasmuch as they be an assembly of men whereof

lately taken place. Some of the new states of South America had, during their contest with their mother country, banished all Spaniards from their territories, not excepting clergymen. Since they have been freed from all alarm, they have zealously set about restoring their religious establishments, and particularly the regular orders. For this purpose, agents with large sums at their disposal, have been sent to Italy, to procure members of these orders to cross the Atlantic. They have been instructed to give preference to Spaniards who have been ejected from their religious houses by the present Spanish Government. And whenever any of them have sought an asylum in the new States, they have been received with marked kindness and hospitality. Thus has the Catholic spirit triumphed over obstinate national prejudices.

all be not governed by the Spirit and Word of God, *may err*, and sometimes *have* erred, even in things appertaining unto God." The *Critic*, indeed, says that this article speaks only "historically of professed and pretended general councils." But, with due deference, we beg to dissent from this interpretation. For though the clause, "and *have* erred," may be only historically added, yet the definition that "they *may* err" is an enunciation of a belief or general principle, inasmuch as it is based upon the circumstance that all the individuals composing a general council are not guided by the word and Spirit of God. Now, as this will apply to every possible general council, as well as to any actual one since that of Jerusalem, we must conclude that the Church of England does not attribute security from error, even to the entire Church of Christ in council assembled. How much less, then, can union with her be an imperative duty on the ground that thereby the individual is secure through union with the Universal Church?

There is another inconsistency in this new scheme of Church authority. The Church in general is allowed to be indefectible, upon the strength of that text, in which our Saviour promises to be with His apostles to the end of the world (p. 395), and other similar passages. When He says, "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me;" the consequence is, that the Church to which these words are addressed

is at all times to be listened to, as the living voice of Christ; and thus it is indefectible. Yet, upon these very texts, the High Church party claim authority for the particular pastors of their Church, as legitimate successors of the apostles. But how shall these texts, addressed to one only body, be it what it may, confer two perfectly dissimilar things on two distinct classes of persons; to wit, indefectibility to the collective, universal Church, and authority to each component part thereof? If the Anglican hierarchy lay claim to one of the gifts, they have as much right to the other. But this is not our present question. We ask on what ground are these texts thus made to cut two ways, to answer two different purposes, without any warranty for the distinction in the texts themselves? Whatever Church is declared to be indefectible, is invested with authority, and none other; and as the Anglican Church does not pretend to the one quality, it can have no claim to the other. If the indefectibility which is the consequence of Christ's teaching through the pastors, be not distributable among particular churches, how is it proved that authority in faith, which is that very teaching, is so distributable? But if the two reside united in the same body, as in consistency they ought, then we say the result is INFALLIBILITY. For indefectibility secures the existence of *objective* truth in the Church at all times; and authority to teach, in conjunction, secures *subjective* truth. In other words, the latter obliges each individual to believe

whatever it teaches, while the former assures him that it can never fall into error.

In fact, infallibility is the active manifestation of indefectibility through authority. Where the fund of wisdom and truth is imperishable and incorruptible, its outward communication must be so too. If the Church is to be heard because Christ teaches in it, the Church is *infallible*,—even as Christ is. All this is in exact harmony with Catholic truth. In this there is no disjunction of what God hath ordained; no drawing of authority for individual churches, and of indefectibility for the Universal Church, from one indivisible text. Both, indeed, are proved; but both in favor of one—of the Catholic Universal Church: and with these the natural result of the two conjoined—*dogmatical infallibility*. In their pastors, the flock recognize the connecting link between them and this great community; they are ruled and taught by them, in strict harmonious unity with the entire Church.

But the Anglican Church can show, as we have already observed, no connection with any other Church, to prove that it forms a part of any larger religious communion. Either she alone is the Universal Catholic Church, or she is out of its pale. If the first, she should claim indefectibility; if the second, she must renounce authority.

By way of conclusion, let us transfer the inquiry to another country. We were at first inclined to choose Ireland or Italy; but particular

exceptions might be taken against both these points of comparison; therefore, we will place the controversy in France. The French Church has a hierarchy, less interrupted in apostolic succession, than the Anglican can possibly pretend to be. The bishops of Gaul may be traced to the second century, or even to the immediate disciples of the apostles; whereas the Anglicans do not pretend to trace their succession further back than the Roman mission under St. Gregory the Great. The succession, too, in France has no awkward passage to explain in its history, such as the turning out of all the bishops by civil persecution, and tacking to the succession a new set, who pretended to inherit the sees, while they rejected the religion, of those before them. But putting aside all these odious comparisons, we will only assume that the Church of France has as good a right at least to claim apostolic succession, with all its prerogatives of authority and obedience, as the Church of England. We ask, therefore, are not the French Protestants chargeable with schism, since they "separate themselves from the Church, and make congregations contrary to their canonical bishops?" (p. 435). Are they not "bound," as much as, according to the *Critic*, the English Catholics are,* "to unite themselves to the French Churches?" (p. 434.)

* The *Critic*, p. 434, applies to the Irish and English Catholics what Barrow says only of the English. The question of the Irish Catholics is more intimately connected with that of the Anglican Episcopacy, and therefore must not be lightly touched on here.

It will not be said that the French Church does not maintain its independence as a national Church, or that by its submission to the supremacy of the Holy See, she has forfeited her rights over all separatists within her dominions. For Barrow expressly writes: "Yet those churches, which by voluntary consent or command of princes, do adhere in confederation to the Roman Church, we are not, merely upon that score, to condemn or reject from the communion of charity or peace; for in that they do but use their liberty."* Now the French Church is not bound certainly by any compulsion to the Roman See; and, therefore, the French Protestants cannot refuse it obedience on this score. But then, perhaps, the French Church "maintains impious errors," or "prescribes naughty practices,"—which the learned doctor adds as a sufficient reason for treating a Church as "heretical or schismatical." And who is to pronounce this judgment for the French Protestant? He himself individually? Then we have private judgment set up against, and above, the decision of the national Church: and thus is the Dissenter's plea made good against the Anglican Church. The body of Christians to which he is attached? Then must similar bodies in England have the same right; and Catholics cannot be schismatics who use this right, and proclaim the Anglican Church to teach "impious errors," and therefore to be itself "heretical and schismatical." Some foreign

* Ubi supra, p. 783.

Church, as the Anglican? Then may the English Catholic be equally guided by the decisions of far more numerous foreign churches. And moreover, according to the theory of independent national churches, each has a right to command full obedience from its own immediate subjects, free from foreign control. But, says the *Critic*, "The Romish Church *generally* is regarded as schismatical in exacting as terms of communion and articles of faith, doctrines which are of uncertain authority" (p. 435). By whom is it so generally regarded? *By the Anglican Church!* And is this, then, an infallible Church, which has a right to set up its decision against the combined decisions of so many other certainly *no less* apostolic churches, which concur in not considering those articles as of uncertain authority, and in condemning the Anglican as heretical? Or are Protestants in Catholic countries bound to recognize in her an authority to rule their belief, against the decisions of the hierarchy in them, while the Catholics or Dissenters in England have no similar resource in any other country? If so, the Anglican Church comes within the gripe of Barrows conclusion,—that if churches be "turbulent and violent, trying by all means *to subdue and enslave other churches* to their will or their dictates; in such cases we may reject such churches as heretical and schismatical, or wickedly uncharitable and unjust in their proceedings."

One of two things. Either it must be left to the individual to decide whether a church proposes

or not "doctrines of uncertain authority," and then his private reason is constituted superior to the Church, and a judge over her decision; or else the decision of any foreign Episcopal Church has as much right to control the individual judgment of each person, and then Protestants in Catholic countries are acknowledged to be heretics. In the first supposition, Dissenters are not heretics nor schismatics with regard to the Established Church; in the second, the French Protestants are bound to subscribe to their belief in Purgatory and Transubstantiation, which the Anglican articles condemn. In either, the writer in the *Critic* has, we imagine, a hard alternative. To use his own words, "we differ from him in logic, as much as in divinity" (p. 397).

Let us place the question under another aspect. These High Church divines say that their Church draws its explanations of Scripture from antiquity, of which it is the witness and depositary. It builds therefore upon this testimony its belief in the Eucharist, and its interpretation of the words employed by our Lord in its institution. But the Catholic Church, that is, the union of many other churches, appeals to precisely the same authority and test, for *its* interpretation and belief. This is not a question of first principles, as whether anything is to be enforced or not which is not clearly proved from Scripture: it is a matter of application of a rule equally admitted. The Zwinglian maintains the Eucharist to be a naked symbol, a

merely commemorative rite. The Catholic and the Anglican contradict him; the former says that tradition has ever taught in his Church a real and corporeal presence of Christ in that sacrament; the Anglican that his Church has learned from the same source to believe in a *real* but not a *corporeal* presence. Who is to decide between the two? Is it the duty of the individual to unravel the mystery for himself, and trace out the testimony of tradition through the first ages? Then private judgment again comes in, and again is exalted as the umpire between conflicting churches! Shall the Anglican Church have the preference? But she renounces all claim to infallibility. And what other plea can she urge, which shall not assume her being the only true Church, and her principle of faith being the only correct one,—which is the very matter of inquiry?

The fact is, that there is no middle point between private judgment and the infallible authority of a living Church, which, being universal, can command particular churches as well as individuals. We would willingly exclude the name of Mr. Blanco White from our pages; but he seems to us at this moment to be a "sign," though not a "wonder,"—a monumental record of this principle, practically illustrated in his double apostasy. He seems to us to have satisfactorily demonstrated, that on the march from Catholicity to Socinianism, and the unlimited use of private judgment, the Church of England presents no resting-

place. It may indeed be passed through on the road, and its curious imitations of the place just left may detain the wanderer's and outcast's attention for a brief space, as it did Mr. White's ; but on he must go, if he be borne forward by a consistent principle, till he reach the other extreme.*

Many observations which have come before our minds we have been compelled to omit, for really there is no end to the incoherences and impracticabilities of the High Church scheme. It presents one inextricable confusion of rights belonging to the Universal Church with those of particular parts or national establishments. The Church is ever spoken of as indefectible—as the depositary of truth—the voice of antiquity, and all this is said of the Universal Church. But when we come to the deference due to it in consequence of these prerogatives, by a process of logical jugglery, the Anglican contrives to step in, to receive it as its right. If these divines would keep the two distinct in their argument, they would find it miserably lame.

We were not a little surprised to see the popular mis-statement repeated in the *Critic's* pages, that Catholics believe their Church empowered to *create* articles of faith (p. 383). They claim for her no more authority than she exercised in the early ages, that of defining what had been believed within her from the beginning, and thus *declaring* articles of faith. The symbols of the ancient coun-

* See his "Observations on Heresy and Orthodoxy," p. 7.

cils, as we have before observed, were only framed against heresies as they arose; and certain points were thus defined and proposed, for the first time, in clear formal terms, to the acceptance of the faithful. Other matters, such as the Eucharist, grace, justification, were omitted, because on them there was no error. Had any existed, the doctrine regarding them would have been as clearly laid down. And there can be no doubt but that a new obligation would thus have fallen upon all Christians, to believe definitely with the Church, on points whereon, before the definition, they could not be so well instructed, nor so accurately know the faith of the Church dispersed. Hence it is not an uncommon remark of judicious and primitive writers, that the Fathers spoke more loosely upon certain subjects before they had been clearly defined by the Church. If this declaration of matters, ever believed, but not before defined, be called a *creation* of new articles, we have no objection to the *Critic's* phrase. But if by this term is signified that, according to Catholics, their Church may propose that to be believed which before was not believed, it is a gross inaccuracy to apply it to us.

In fact we believe the Church, in regard to her authority, to have no past and no future. She is always one; and whatever she had ever a right to do at the Apostles' time, she has a right to do at present. When the *Critic*, or Mr. Keble, sends us back to antiquity as the rule of faith,

joined to Scripture, and thereby means the doctrine of the three or four first centuries, we beg to remind him that these times were once *the present* of the Church. The faithful of those days did not, could not, look to "antiquity," which then was not, but to the *living* church. What was their rule of faith is ours; three hundred years, or eighteen hundred, from the time of Christ, cannot make a difference in a principle; it was nowhere appointed, or decreed, or foretold that for so many centuries the *existing* Church should teach, and that, after that time, she should lose her guaranty, and be only the witness to antiquity. Yet so much must the *Critic* pretend, by boasting that the Catholic "gives to the existing Church the ultimate infallible decision in matters of saving faith . . . and the Anglican to antiquity, giving authority to the Church as being the witness and voice . . . of antiquity." What that antiquity held, we hold, for *it* could not acknowledge any authority but the *existing* Church.

Moreover, the High Church principle only removes the difficulties of Protestantism, or as these divines prefer calling it, of *ultra-Protestantism*, another step; but it does not obviate them completely. Antiquity, as deposited in the writings of the early ages, is a dead letter as much as the Bible: it requires a living interpreter, no less. It has its obscurities, its perplexities, its apparent contradictions as much; it requires a guide equally to conduct us through its mazes. It cannot step in

and decide between conflicting opinions and rival claims; it can, at most, be a code which requires a judge to apply it. It is more voluminous, more complex, more uncompact than Scripture; it needs more some methodizing and harmonizing, authoritative, expounder. If national churches can seperately fulfil these offices, and sufficiently discharge these duties, they surely ought not to come to contradictory conclusions. Yet the Anglican stands in stark opposition to every other Episcopal Church throughout the world; its own daughter in America perhaps excepted.

And yet, narrow as are the limits of this Church, its principle of faith has not secured to it the blessing which should be its destined result, —a steadfast unity of belief among its members. We speak not merely of the prevalence of dissent, but of the vast differences which the controversies, treated of in this article, have shown to exist between the members of the Anglican Church. The *British Critic* proposes a synod of that Church, as the best means of settling its present difficulties. Once more we say, let it be called, and we shall see how the Kebles and the Russells, the Newmans and the Arnolds, the Puseys and the Bickersteths, will agree in defining the first principle of faith, the ground on which all other controversies should be decided.

At the same time, comprehensive, nay, vast as is the pale of Catholicity, and embracing, as it does, every zone, and every quarter of the globe,

let a council be called of its pastors, and you would see how differently *its* rule has attained the end of its existence, in the universal harmony it has produced in belief and practice. There you might interrogate a bishop from New Spain, or a vicar-apostolic from Sweden, a professor of the Sorbonne, or a country curate from the Abruzzi; you might consult the catechism taught to the child in Ireland, or to the native convert in the Philippine Islands, without discovering any wavering or hesitation on the question of church authority, or on any doctrine by it defined.

And by this comparison, it may be seen how in the Catholic Church the manifestation of the Son of Man, and the living Word of the Father, is, "as the lightning which cometh out of the east, and shineth even into the west," one single, indivisible and unsearchable blaze of light, pervading the entire heaven of human intelligence, from hemisphere to hemisphere. But if, on the one hand, when we are told, "Lo! He is in the desert," in camp-meetings, and field-preachings and revivals, amidst the mad exuberance of ultra-Protestant zeal, "we go not forth;" so, on the other, we hope to be pardoned if, on being modestly assured that "He is in the secret chambers" of one or two colleges in Oxford, where alone his doctrines may be had in their purity, "we believe it not."*

* Matt. xxiv. 24, 26.

There is one point on which we fully agree with the *Critic*, and as it forms the beginning of his article, so it shall form the conclusion of ours. In common with many recent writers, he is of opinion that the controversies between our two Churches are only now fairly commencing. He thinks justly, that hitherto we have been assailed "rather by the power of the civil sword than by the arguments of divines" (p. 374). The privilege of even attacking has been till now all on the other side, and we have been condemned, as a caste, to the ignobler labors of apology and defence. The staff of the oppressor hath now, however, been broken, we stand upon more equal ground, and it is our own fault if we follow not up our advantages. If the battle, of reason we mean, and argument, has now to be fought, we, at least, will not steal away from the field; our habits and feelings would suggest another course, and prompt us, like Tasso's shepherd, to seek seclusion from the war, in the humbler task of our own improvements, or of mere domestic duties. But there are times when every citizen is a soldier, in the spiritual as in civil warfare; and a crisis like this is one. The course which we shall pursue shall be consistent and persevering. We seek not the wealth of our Anglican neighbors, nor their establishment, nor their political power, nor their usurped influence. All these things we esteem as dross. But we covet their brotherhood in the faith, and their participation in our security

of belief, and their being bound to us in cords of love, through religious unity. For these things we will contend unceasingly, and to the utmost of our power; and GOD DEFEND THE RIGHT!

"TRACTS FOR THE TIMES."

PART I.

(From the *Dublin Review* for April, 1838.)

ART. II.—*Tracts for the Times.* 3 vols. London: 1833–6.

THE times, Heaven knows, are sufficiently bad. It is a work of charity to try to mend them. The collection of Tracts, some very short, others of considerable length, which forms the three volumes before us, was published for this purpose. As a well-intentioned attempt, it deserves our sympathy. It is a proof of great zeal, of considerable intrepidity, and of some research. The Tracts are the production of a well-known knot of divines at or from Oxford, the determined foes of dissent, the inconsistent adversaries of Catholicity, and the blind admirers of the Anglican Church. In other words, they are written by stanch asserters of High Church principles.

Will they succeed in their work? We firmly believe they will: nay, strange to say, we hope so. As to patching up, by their prescriptions, the worn-out constitution of the poor old English Church, it is beyond human power. "Curavimus

Babylonem et non est sanata" (Jer. li. 9), will be their discovery in the end. It is no longer a matter of rafters and partition-walls; the foundations have given way, the main buttresses are rent; and we are not sure but that one who has been, for three centuries, almost deprived of sight, and kept toiling in bondage, not at, but under the grinding wheel, has his hands upon the great pillars that support it, and having roused himself in his strength, may be about to give them a fearful shake. We speak only of moral power, but it is of the immense moral power of truth.

How, then, will they succeed? Not by their attempts to heal, but by their blows to wound. Their spear may be like that in Grecian fable, which inflicted a gash, but let out an ulcer. They strike boldly and deeply into the very body of dissent, and the morbid humors of Protestantism will be drained out. Let this be done, and Catholic vitality will circulate in their place. They show no mercy to those who venture to break unity in their Church; and like all unmerciful judges, they must expect no mercy. Why did *you* separate from the Roman Church? is a question that every reader of these volumes will ask twenty times. He will find, it is true, what is intended for an answer given him as often; but he will be an easily-satisfied inquirer, if any of these answers prove sufficient for him.

The scope of these Tracts seems to us twofold. First, they endeavor to revive, in the Anglican

Church, a love of ancient principles and practices, by showing on how many points it has departed from them, and how wholesome it would be to return to them. Secondly, they endeavor to place their Church upon the foundation of apostolical succession, enforcing their claims to authority upon the laity, and pressing the clergy to a maintenance of it as a right. Antiquity and authority are their watchwords. They consequently maintain that the English Church has suffered great change during the last century, in having become too Protestant (No. 38.) The Fathers of the Reformation, as they are called, are said by them to have kept close to primitive practices, and consequently to have separated less (this they are obliged to own) from the Romish—that is, the Catholic—Church, than their successors. The Anglican Church, therefore, already stands in need of another reformation (No. 38), which shall lead it back to what those Fathers made it. There must have been a sting in this confession. But still it is made boldly—with profession, however, that such an approach to Catholicity, would only be so inasmuch as we have better preserved primitive forms.

The two heads which we have just rehearsed, as embracing the subject-matter of these books, often run into one another, and it is not always easy to separate them. For authority, based upon apostolical succession, is necessarily a part of antiquity; and ancient practices and doctrines are

upheld by an appeal to authority. Wishing, as we do, to treat of these two matters distinctly, we shall endeavor to examine each upon its own peculiar merits; and perhaps we shall better succeed in keeping them distinct, by making each the subject of a separate paper. We shall, therefore, confine ourselves at present to the desire of bringing back the Anglican Church to ancient practices.

The inquiry into this sentiment presents itself to our minds under the form of a very simple question. What was gained by the Reformation, considered as these authors would have it, that is, as a purgation of such malpractices and errors as time had introduced into primitive usages and belief and a return to the purity of the early ages? Two things should seem to have been necessary to authorize the naming a religious change by such a title. First, all that was really abuse should have been skilfully removed, yet so as to leave all that was ancient and good. If a surgeon, in cutting away a gangrene, cut off a sound limb, he would be said rather to destroy than to heal. Secondly, such measures should have been taken, as that similar or worse abuses should not again return. If it had required a thousand years to deform the Church so as to call for a first Reformation, this would have proved, too, a sorry work, if, in a couple of hundred more, things were to become as bad again. Still worse it would be, if the very Reformation itself should open a door to similar, or worse, abuses.

It will be a curious and unexpected result of such mighty convulsions in the religious and political world as the *Reformation* caused, that the great safeguards of revealed truth should have been pulled down; the stable foundation of divinely appointed regiment in the Church plucked up; rites and ceremonies coeval with Christianity abolished; practices come down from the first ages discontinued and discountenanced; and ordinances, believed of old to have been apostolical, abrogated and condemned. And yet all this must be called a "godly work of reformation," that same "Reformation" signifying a repristination of primitive Christianity! But will it not be stranger, to see the old religion, which needed such an operation, preserving all these good things intact, to the jealousy of the Reformed; in such wise that when this one should wish to return to purer or perfecter forms, it must needs seek its models in the other? Shall we upon examination find things so? Let us see.

1. Episcopal authority is justly considered by the tract writers as the foundation of Church government. Of its present state in their Church they write as follows, having quoted passages from St. Clement of Rome, and St. Ignatius Martyr:—

"With these and other strong passages in apostolical Fathers, how can we permit ourselves in our present *practical* disregard of episcopal authority? Are not we apt to obey only so far as the law obliges us? Do we support the bishop, and strive to move all along with him as our bond

of union and head? Or is it not our every-day conduct, as if, except with respect to certain periodical forms and customs, we were each independent in his own parish?"—No. 8, p. 8.

"We who believe the Nicene Creed must acknowledge it a high privilege that we belong to the Apostolic Church. How is it that so many of us are, almost avowedly, so cold and indifferent in our thoughts of this privilege? . . . Scripture at first sight is express" (in favor of the divine ministerial commission). . . . "*The primitive Christians read it accordingly: and cherished with all affectionate reverence the privilege which they thought they found there. Why are we so unlike them?*"—No. 4, p. 1.

"I readily allow that this view of our calling has something in it too high and mysterious to be fully understood by unlearned Christians. But the learned, surely, are just as unequal to it. It is part of that ineffable mystery, called in our creed the communion of saints, etc. . . . Why should we despair of obtaining, in time, an influence far more legitimate, and less dangerously exciting," (than that obtained by the upholders of the holy discipline,) "but equally searching and extensive, by the diligent inculcation of our *true* and *Scriptural* claim?' For it is obvious that among other results of the primitive doctrine of the apostolical succession, thoroughly considered and followed up, it would make the relation of pastor and parishioner far more engaging, as well as more awful, than it is usually considered at present."—P. 76.

It is certain that all here desired existed in the English Church down to the time of the Reformation; it is certain that it exists in all countries that have remained Catholic; it is certain that it exists among those who have clung to the old faith in these islands. What, then, was gained by the Reformation on this score? Had you remained a Catholic, you would have had no "practical disre-

gard of episcopal authority," nor would each clergyman have acted "as if independent" of his bishop. Had you remained Catholic, you would have found no difficulty in causing this article of the Nicene Creed to be heartily believed and followed up; nor would you have found yourselves so "unlike the primitive Christians" in your feelings and conduct respecting it. You would have had no need of treating as a matter not desperate, the prospect of one day acquiring the influence over your flocks which unepiscopal teachers have acquired. A reformed, apostolic Church not to *despair* of acquiring an influence which it possessed before it was *reformed*! If, in regard to episcopal authority and its practical influence, the Reformation did no good, did it do any harm? Clearly so. For if this authority was practically lost only after the Reformation, and only where the Reformation was adopted, this must evidently be charged with having caused the practical abandonment of one of the articles of the Nicene Creed, and produced a great dissimilarity between its followers and the primitive Christians. We unreformed have continued to resemble them. How obstinate of us not to embrace the Reformation!

2. The sad effects of this loss of practical authority in the episcopacy are even more awful than the cause itself. This authority, it is often repeated through these volumes, is not so clearly contained in Scripture as might, *à priori*, have been expected. Men are thus easily led to reject,

or, at least, to despise it. This, of course, they would not, if they laid a proper stress on tradition. The consequence of this departure from traditional teaching, in one respect, leads to a similar departure in more important ones: for instance, regarding the doctrines of the blessed Trinity and the Incarnation. Consider well what follows:

"What shall we say, when we consider that a case of doctrine, necessary doctrine, doctrine the very highest and most sacred, may be produced where the argument lies as little on the surface of Scripture—where the proof, though *most conclusive*, is as indirect and circuitous as that for episcopacy, viz., the doctrine of the Trinity? Where is this solemn and comfortable mystery formally stated in the Scriptures as we find it in the creeds? Why is it not? Let a man consider whether all the objections which he urges against episcopacy may not be turned against his own belief in the Trinity. It is a happy thing for themselves that men are inconsistent: yet it is miserable to advocate and establish a *principle* which, not in their own case indeed, but in the case of others who learn it of them, leads to Socinianism. This being considered, can we any longer wonder at the awful fact that the descendants of Calvin, the first Presbyterian, are at the present day in the number of those who have denied the Lord who bought them?"—No. 45, p. 5

"For the present, referring to that ineffable mystery (the Incarnation), from which, on this day especially, all our devout thoughts should begin, and in which they should end, I would only ask one question:—*What will be the feelings of a Christian, particularly of a Christian pastor, should he find hereafter that, in slighting or discouraging apostolical claims and views (be the temptation what it may), he has really been helping the evil spirit to unsettle man's faith in* THE INCARNATION OF THE SON OF GOD?"—No. 54, p. 12.

These are, indeed, awful consequences of the unsettling of men's minds caused by the Refor-

mation. And they are clearly traceable and imputable to that event. For be the doctrine of Anglicanism what it may, respecting Scripture and tradition, it is evident that in it, as in all Protestant communions, exclusively, could exist this haggling about proofs, because not clear in the written Word. This is manifest: that among Catholics it is not usual for the faithful, still less for pastors, to question, or to "slight, or to discourage, apostolical claims and views:" nor has any one, so far as we know, contended that the dogmas of the Trinity and Incarnation have been perilled amongst us, through insufficient views of Church polity. These, therefore, are peculiar blessings introduced by the godly Reformation. In the English reformed Church a door has been opened to Socinianism, which was close barred before it became reformed; and which the unreformed Catholics still contrive to keep well shut. With such confessions, is it strange that we should not be enamored of the *Reformation*?

3. The constitutional weakness of the body episcopal could not but be followed by the enervation of its right arm. It has long ceased to wield the thunder-bolt of ecclesiastical reproof and public censure against incorrigible sinners or open apostates.

"CHURCH REFORM.—All parts of Christendom have much to confess and reform. We have our sins as well as the rest. Oh that *we* would take the lead in the renovation of the Church Catholic on Scripture principles.

"Our greatest sin, perhaps, is the disuse of a 'godly discipline.' Let the reader consider—

"1. The command.—'Put away from yourselves the wicked person.' 'A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject.' 'Mark them which cause divisions and offences, and avoid them.'

"2. The example, viz., in the primitive Church.—'The persons or objects of ecclesiastical censure were all such delinquents as fell into great and scandalous crimes after baptism, whether men or women, priests or people, rich or poor, princes or subjects.'—Bingham, Antiq. xvi. 3.

"3. The warning.—'Whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven.'"—No. 8, p. 4.

Until the Reformation, this godly discipline was in use. Even as yet, in Catholic countries and in our own, ecclesiastical censures are in force, and may be incurred by the violation of the ecclesiastical law. Sometimes they are inflicted by special decree, and are held in the greatest awe by priests and people. We have seen, on the Continent, excommunication taken off before a vast concourse of people, with all the solemn ceremonial of the ancient Church. The king-queller Napoleon felt the power of the Pontiff's arm, and staggered beneath the blow of his excommunication. Not long ago the present Pope pronounced it in general terms against all the participators in an outrage upon his authority; and numbers, conscience-stricken, secretly entreated for absolution.* The "godly discipline" was

* [Gregory XVI. excommunicated such persons as had taken part in an insurrection, etc., at Ancona.]

lost at, and by, the godly Reformation: the Church of England went back from "the example of the primitive Church," when it pretended to return to primitive Christianity: it soon forgot the divine "command," in its eagerness to combat the supposed human commands which it imputed to the Catholic Church. And the latter, which pertinaciously opposed this strange return to primitive Christianity, somehow or other has contrived to keep to this example of the early Church.

4. Another great departure from primitive Christianity, caused by the Reformation, was, according to the Tract-writers, the curtailment of the Church services:—"The services of our Church," they write, "as they now stand, are but a very small portion of the ancient Christian worship: and, though people nowadays think them too long, there can be no doubt that the primitive believers would have thought them too short." (No. 9.) The writer then explains himself farther, by observing that the early Christians, taking literally the scriptural invitation to praise God seven times a day, instituted the canonical hours. "Throughout the Churches which used the Latin tongue," he adds, "the same services were used with very little variation: and in Roman Catholic countries they continue in use, with only a few modern interpolations, even to this day" (p. 2). Here, then, is a plain confession. The first Christians, in conformity to scriptural suggestion, insti-

tuted a certain form of prayer, divided into seven portions, and of considerable length. This was in actual use at the time of the Reformation, with very little variation. Well, the restorers of ancient practices, the purgers of all modern abuses, sweep away the whole system: the unyielding Catholics keep hold of it, and possess it till this day. Which was right?—or what good did the Reformation do here?

Towards the end of the paper we have quoted, there are several statements respecting these offices which need emendation. It is pretended that already before the Reformation the offices of the Church had been compressed into two groups, called matins and vespers, and the spirit which had ordered them in their primitive form had been lost. That consequently, "conscious of the incongruities of primitive forms and modern feelings, the reformers undertook to construct a service more in accordance with the spirit of their age. They adopted the English language; they curtailed the already compressed ritual of the early Christians, etc."

As to the first part of these reflections, we observe, that it is by no means common in religious communities, to group the offices together as stated. Matins are generally sung alone, by many orders at midnight, by some over-night, by others early in the morning. Prime is sung at daybreak, and the shorter canonical hours later, with mass interposed, often a solemn mass between every two.

Vespers and complin are also performed separately. In collegiate churches, where the canons reside at some distance from the church, the offices are more brought together. It may be said that the writer of the Tract spoke only of the state of things at the Reformation. If so, we have not the means at hand to verify his assertion. But we will take it as well grounded; what follows? Why that the Catholic Church contrived to correct abuses then existing, without abolishing the ordinances which they effected. That she, at least, knew the difference between destruction and reformation. Why could not the Protestants do the same? In their zeal to return to primitive practices, why did they abolish them? Surely the Catholic Church proved that it was not necessary to humor modern feelings by such sacrifices. Which, then, is the true lover, follower, or restorer of early Christian observances?

On the latter part of our extract we frankly own that when first we perused it, we were quite mistaken. We fancied that the writer meant to cast some censure on the adoption of the English language, in preference to that uniform speech, "which had reversed the curse of Babel." By Dr. Pusey's vindication of the Tracts, we learn that such was not the author's meaning, but that the passage in question was favorable to the change of language. (Vol. iii. p. 17.) We think any dispassionate reader would not have so understood it. However, it is plain that if the reformers found it

necessary to abridge the service of the Church, in compliance with the spirit of the age, it could not have been the spirit of a *papistical* age, as Dr. Pusey there explains it. For our Church, which he thus designates, has found no need of curtailing, or of farther compression, but rather found means to correct abuses.

But this matter of ancient Church offices lost at the Reformation is treated more at length in the 75th, and following Tracts. In these, the entire office for Sunday, for the dead, and for several festivals, is given by way of specimens. But the sentences introductory to the explanation there premised of these offices, are unmatched in controversial assurance. They are as follows:—

"There is so much of excellence and beauty in the services of the Breviary, that, were it skilfully set before the Protestant by Romanistic controversialists as the book of devotions received in their communion, it would undoubtedly raise a prejudice in their favor, if he were ignorant of the circumstances of the case, and but ordinarily candid and unprejudiced. To meet this danger is one principal object of these pages; in which whatever is good and true in those devotions will be claimed, and on reasonable grounds, for the Church Catholic in opposition to the Roman Church, whose real claim above other Churches is that of having adopted into the service certain additions and novelties, ascertainable to be such in history, as well as being corruptions doctrinally. In a word, it will be attempted to wrest a weapon out of our adversaries' hands; who have in this, as in many instances, appropriated to themselves a treasure which was ours as much as theirs; and then, in our attempt to recover it, accuse us of borrowing what we have but lost through inadvertence."

The only real claim of our Church above other Churches (*e. g.* the Anglican) consists in having made some addition to the Breviary! The having known how to appreciate it, and having kept it, go for nothing. Suppose a case in point.

Two brothers are in joint possession of a noble estate, descended to them from their remote ancestors. The younger, prodigal-like, considers it not worth having, abandons it with contempt, and by public deed, takes instead of it a new paltry patch of uncultivated ground. After 300 years his descendant comes out, and says to the other's heir, "Sir, I will thank you to understand that your fine ancestral mansion and broad domains are mine quite as much as yours. It is exceedingly impertinent of you to call your own what once belonged to my family as well as to yours. I claim it 'on reasonable grounds,' for my ancestors lost it 'through inadvertence.' Nothing is yours except certain additional buildings, which it was a great presumption in you to erect." "This is indeed a strange claim," the other might reply; "I was by no means prepared for it. But surely, sir, you will allow that three centuries of undisputed and exclusive possession, and no small labor and expense in cultivating and preserving it, give *some* little superiority of right to the property, over that of former coproprietorship, 'inadvertently' (that means, I suppose, *very foolishly*) cast away, by one who publicly chose a substitute for it?" "None upon earth, my dear sir," the claimant rejoins: "none

upon earth, as you must clearly see. It is true, that if *you* had not kept it uninterruptedly in your family so long, and if your fathers had not bestowed great pains upon it, *I* should not have now known where to put my hands upon it. But that only makes it a matter of greater convenience for *me;* it can give no right to *you.* Now that I choose to have the property again, I shall be extremely obliged to you, if you will no longer call it yours. As for your additional buildings, I shall take them down at the earliest opportunity."

Such is the reasoning which these grave divines pursue to wrest from us the Breviary of which they are jealous. Every single *reformed* country, through "inadvertence," lost this collection of offices. We have never heard of an Anglican, German, Swedish, Danish, or Dutch Breviary. Had all Europe followed the example of reformation, it is clear that the Breviary would have been now known only from manuscripts, or a few black-letter editions. Virtually it would have been lost in the Church. Yet it is a service which "seems to have continued more or less, in the same constituent parts, though not in order or system, from apostolic times" (p. 3). Now the dear old obstinate Roman Church could not be brought into the strange inadvertency of reforming itself, by casting away this apostolic institution. She tried another plan. The council of Trent passed measures for its correction. St. Pius V. carried them into effect, and subsequent

pontiffs completed the work. Every ecclesiastic in the Catholic Church is bound to the daily recital of the Breviary. In fact, the writer in the Tracts cannot give it any intelligible name but that of the "*Roman* Breviary." And yet it is no more ours than theirs who no longer possess it!

However, we are not disposed to quarrel seriously about our rights on this head. Let it first be restored, and practically enforced, in their Anglican Church. Let us first learn that in all the collegiate churches it is daily sung with the punctuality that it is in those of France or Italy. Let us see published a "Breviarium Anglicanum ad usum Ecclesiæ Cantuariensis," as we have one for St. Peter's Church at Rome, or Notre-Dame in Paris. Let us be informed that each portly dignitary has furnished himself with a Plantinian quarto, and that every curate pockets, on leaving home, a Norwich duodecimo. Put yourselves upon a footing of equality with us in point of *possession*, and it will be quite time enough to discuss the question of *right* to the property.

5. Intimately connected with this matter, which, perhaps, we have too lengthily examined, is another—the loss of daily service.

"Since the Reformation, the same gradual change in the prevailing notions of prayer has worked its way silently but generally. The services, as they were left by the Reformers, were, as they had been from the first ages, *daily* services: they are now *weekly* services. Are they not in a fair way to become *monthly?*"—No. 9, p. 3.

If, at the sixteenth century, there was a ten-

dency to shorten and diminish the services, this tendency was completely stopped in all *Catholic* countries, and only went on "working its way" in *Protestant*. Which gained on this score, those who reformed, or those who refused to do so? Again, the services of the Catholic Church yet remain what they then were, daily services. Every cathedral, collegiate, and generally every conventual, church, all over Catholic Christendom, has daily performed in it the divine office, with a numerous attendance of the members of its chapter or community. Besides this, every church and chapel is open daily to the devotion of the faithful, and the divine Eucharistic sacrifice is daily offered in each. We, therefore, are in no danger of seeing *our* offices become monthly, or even weekly. The 25*th Tract* contains an extract from a sermon of Bishop Beveridge, in which this neglect of daily prayer is condemned as a breach of duty. After quoting the rubrics concerning this matter, the bishop thus urges it on the clergy:—"But notwithstanding this great care that our Church hath taken to have *daily Prayers* in every parish, we see, by sad experience, they are shamefully neglected, all the kingdom over; there being very few places where they have any Public Prayers upon the week-days, except, perhaps, upon Wednesdays and Fridays; because it is expressly commanded that both Morning and Evening Prayers be read *every day* in the week, as the Litany upon those. And why this command-

ment should be neglected more than the other, for my part I can see no reason. But I see plain enough that it is a great fault, a plain breach of the known laws of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, and particularly of that part of it which, by his blessing, settled among us." We leave it to the sensible reader to conclude whether the Reformation did good or harm in this part of Christian duty. We will trust him also with the decision as to which Church has stuck closest to the primitive practice.

6. Besides the performance of daily service, the daily celebration of the Lord's Supper was appointed at the Reformation, with the practice of daily, and still more, weekly, communion. It is allowed, that when the Reformation was introduced, these practices were followed in England. For another extract from the same bishop, published in the 26th Tract, acknowledges this: "Where we may observe, first, that in those days there was daily communion in cathedral churches, and other places, as there used to be in the primitive Church" (p. 9). Proof is then given of this practice in St. Paul's. "From whence it is plain that the communion was then celebrated in that church every day. And so it was even in parish churches." Of which likewise proof is given. The loss of this primitive practice is called in capital letters, "A SIN OF THE CHURCH" (Tr. 6, p. 4), that is, of the Anglican. For it is the practice solemnly to celebrate the Eucharistic rite, or, as

we express it, to say Mass, every day, in every Catholic church over the world, as it was in England when the Reformation took place. And as this custom is acknowledged to have been primitive and apostolic, we presume it will be granted that, in this respect, as in the preceding, the unreformed have been more successful than the reformed.

7. Let us proceed with rites or practices belonging to this Blessed Sacrament. And first, take a less important one :—

"A poor woman mentioned, with much respect, her father's practice never to taste food before receiving the Lord's Supper, adhering unconsciously to the practice of the Church in its better days, and, indeed, of our own in Bishop Taylor's time."—Tr. 66, p. 11.

These better days were the earliest ages. The abuses introduced into the Church of Corinth are groundedly supposed to have led to the practice here mentioned. Tertullian describes the Eucharist as that which was received "ante omnem cibum,"—before every other food. Thus has another primitive observance, held in England till the Reformation, and even continued for some time after, through the impulse of preceding better principles, been completely lost. So much for the efficacy of the Reformation in retaining primitive practices. What shall we say of its ability to return to them? We need not add, that this practice is rigidly followed in the Catholic Church, just as it was in "better days."

8. When the spirit of reformation invaded England, the country was in possession of a liturgy, precisely that which we Catholics now use. On this, let us have the opinion of the Tract writers:—"All liturgies now existing, except those in use in Protestant countries, profess to be derived from very remote antiquity." (No. 63, p. 1.) After this preliminary sentence, the writer proceeds to show, from a comparison of the different liturgies, the justice of their claim. He thus speaks of ours:—"Another liturgy, which can be traced back with tolerable certainty to very remote time, is the Roman Missal." Manuscripts are then referred to, which prove the Mass to have been essentially the same when revised by Pope St. Gregory the Great in 590, and a century earlier by Gelasius, and even under Pope St. Leo the Great. "It also deserves to be noticed, that, at the time when the Roman Liturgy was undergoing these successive revisals, a tradition all along prevailed attributing to one part of it an apostolic origin, and that this part does not appear to have undergone any change whatever. Virgilius, who was Pope between the times of Gelasius and Gregory tells us, that the "canonical prayers," or what is now called the 'Canon of the Mass,' had been handed down as an apostolical tradition. And much earlier we hear the same from Pope Innocent, who adds, that the apostle from whom they derived it was St. Peter" (p. 5).

On this precious deposit of apostolical tradition,

received from St. Gregory by the English Church, on its conversion, the Anglican reformers laid their sacrilegious hands. These worthy champions of primitive usages, these pious vindicators of the early ages, these zealous restorers of apostolic piety, recklessly (shall we say "through inadvertence?") rejected and abolished this venerable monument of antiquity, and substituted a patchwork liturgy, or "communion service," in which hardly a rite or a prayer is observed that existed in the old. In pages 8 and 9 of the cited Tract are tables to prove this. The four principal ancient liturgies are compared together, viz., St. Peter's or the Roman, St. James's or the Oriental, St. Mark's or the Egyptian, and St. John's or the Ephesian and Mozarabic. The result is, that in *eleven* points connected with the consecration and communion, they all wonderfully agree. This number might have been probably increased; but we are content to take the statement of the Tract. The communion service discards *five* of these points, alters and mutilates some of the remainder, and arranges the little it has preserved in a different order from any. The statement of this modification is coolly introduced by these words: "The English Reformers prefer an order different from any of these" (p. 8). We will not enter into any discussion about their right to do so. Oh, no! It would have been quite a pity, if, by any chance, they had preserved in a modern religion practices of such venerable antiquity. But, at any rate, do

not call such men *Reformers*. If you will, do not tell us that the purpose of the Reformation was only to clear away modern abuses, and to retain and restore all that was primitive and apostolical! You yourselves say, "It may perhaps be said without exaggeration, that next to the Holy Scriptures, they [the ancient liturgies] possess the greatest claim to our veneration and study" (p. 16). Yet they whom you call your Fathers made no scruple of abolishing or completely disfiguring them.

On the other side, we need hardly remind our readers that the Catholic Liturgy, or Mass, as now used, and translated in pocket missals, is nearly word for word identical with that of Gelasius, referred to in our Tract. This subject, however, deserves a fuller discussion than we can at present afford it.

9. Among the points excluded from the Liturgy at the Reformation, one is thus specified: "And likewise another prayer (which has been excluded from the English Ritual) 'for the rest and peace of all those who have departed this life in God's faith and fear,' concluding with a prayer for communion with them" (p. 7.). On this subject Dr. Pusey enlarges in a letter, now prefixed to the third volume of the Tracts. He allows that this prayer was excluded from the Anglican Liturgy, by "yielding to the judgment of foreign ultra-reformers." We need not observe that Catholics have retained the practice and the words. Nor

should we find it difficult, in a proper place, to disprove Dr. Pusey's assertions, respecting the object of these prayers in the ancient Church, and to show that it was the same as Catholics now propose to themselves.

10. When the most solemn of all Christian rites was thus rudely and irreverently treated, it must not surprise us to find others less important, handled in like manner. Dr. Pusey has divided into three Tracts (67–69) a long treatise on "Scriptural views of Holy Baptism." It deserves, in many respects, our highest praise; and we freely give it. At pages 266 and following, he presents, in parallel columns, those baptismal rites which were very generally, if not universally, observed in the ancient Church, and which we have retained. The Anglicans, too, kept them for a time. But naturally they could not understand their worth, and sacrificed them to the good pleasure of Bucer. Dr. Pusey thus laments the loss of those primitive observances:—"We have lost by all those omissions. Men are impressed by these visible actions, far more than they are aware, or wish to acknowledge. Two points especially were thereby visibly inculcated, which men seem now almost wholly to have lost sight of—the power of our enemy Satan, and the might of our Blessed Redeemer" (p. 242). Thus we see what a practical influence on faith these omissions may have. Again: "It has undoubtedly been a device of Satan to persuade men that this expulsion of himself (by the exorcism

prefixed to our baptism) was unnecessary;* he has thereby secured a more undisputed possession. Whether the rite can be again restored in our Church; without greater evil, God only knoweth; or whether it be not irrevocably forfeited; but this is certain, that until it be restored, we shall have much more occasion to warn our flocks of the devices and power of him against whom they have to contend" (p. 243).

Hence, in another Tract, these authors feelingly deplore the loss, or, better to speak, the rejection, of the Catholic Ritual. After quoting passages from the Fathers, upon the origin of many ceremonies still retained by us, they conclude, "that, as a whole, the Catholic Ritual was a precious possession; and if we, who have escaped from Popery, have lost not only the possession, but the sense of its value, it is a serious question whether we are not like men who recover from some serious illness, with the loss or injury of their sight or hearing; whether we are not like the Jews returned from captivity, who could

*[What an acknowledgment. Part of the Anglican rite of baptism, in other words, part of the administration of a sacrament, is a device of Satan; for prayers mutilated by him cannot be God's work, or have his approval. What wonder that a system, which has been so far cursed as to be permitted to have God and man's enemy allowed to tamper with its sacramental rites, should have lost all true sense of the doctrine connected with them? Belief in baptismal regeneration may well have disappeared from an establishment where Satan has had a hand in reforming the form of baptismal administration.]

never find the rod of Aaron or the Ark of the Covenant, which, indeed, had ever been hid from the world, but then was removed from the temple itself." (No. 34.)

These are grievous lamentations. Thank God, *we* have no reason to make them. The deposit of traditional practices, which we received from our forefathers, we have kept inviolate. We have rejected no rite, we have hardly admitted one, in the administration of the sacrament, since the days of Gelasius or Gregory.

11. Another primitive practice avowedly neglected in the English Church, is that of fasting, and other austerities. Dr. Pusey has written several tracts upon the subject. In one he says: "I would fain hope that there will not long be this variance between our principles and our practice." (No. 18, p. 21.) Again: "The other fasts of the Church require the less to be dwelt upon, either because, as in Lent, her authority is in some degree recognized, although it be very imperfectly and capriciously obeyed," etc. (p. 23). In this tract, as in many others, a captious spirit, in relation to Catholics, is observable. We lament it. It is but little creditable to the writer. "To urge," he writes, "that fasts were abused by the latter Romish Church, is but to assert that they are a means of grace committed to men, etc. It was then among the instances of calm judgment in the Reformers of our Prayer-book" (we have seen specimens of this calm judgment), "that, cutting

off the abuses which before prevailed, the vain distinctions of meats, the luxurious abstinences, the lucrative dispensations, they still prescribed fasting. . . . . The Reformers omitted that which might be a snare to men's consciences: they left it to every man's Christian prudence and experience *how* he would fast, but they prescribed the days upon which he should fast, both in order to obtain a unity of feeling and devotion in the members of Christ's body, and to preclude the temptation to the neglect of the duty altogether" (p. 7). Yet, on the whole, the duty, as a general one, *is* neglected. The Common-prayer book prescribes as days of fasting or abstinence, "All the Fridays in the year, except Christmas day." Is this observed in the Anglican Church? The forty days of Lent; are they observed? The Ember days; are they observed? Yet among Catholics, in England as on the continent, all these days are strictly observed; all Fridays by abstinence, and all the rest by fasts. The appointment of days, then, was not sufficient. The Reformers, with all their calm judgment, went wrong in not prescribing *how* men are to fast. But, in reality, they rooted up in the Church all the principles by which alone fasting could be practically preserved in it. There is something, therefore, to say the least, ungenerous and unhandsome in praising the Reformers at the expense of the Catholics, for "cutting off abuses which before prevailed," when this amputation was so clumsily performed, as to lead to the total

destruction of the thing itself. And this unhandsomeness is doubled by the consideration that if these abuses existed till then, Catholics were able to correct them without any such violent effects. For if dispensations were then lucrative, they certainly are not so now, either in this country or abroad. There is a heavy penalty in Italy, renewed every year, not only upon every ecclesiastical authority receiving a fee for giving a dispensation from abstinence during Lent, but upon any medical man demanding it, for a certificate of weak health, intended for obtaining such dispensation. The difference, then, between our Church and the Anglican has been this; that, *supposing* dispensations till the sixteenth century to have been lucrative, *we* wisely removed the lucre, but kept the necessity of dispensation by ecclesiastical authority, and thereby preserved the practice itself. The Anglicans, retaining the ecclesiastical precept of fasting on stated days, with what Dr. Pusey considers "calm judgment, vested in each individual the dispensing power, lest it should be lucrative to pastors; and of course lost all ecclesiastical power of enforcing an ecclesiastical precept. When each man is constituted his own judge, when selfishness is made the supreme umpire between the appetite and an irksome, painful duty, it is easy to foresee the decision. We are sure that a Protestant clergyman would be astonished if one of his parishioners called upon him at the commencement of Lent, or in an Ember week, to ask his per-

mission, as a pastor and organ of his Church, not to fast. He would probably be more astonished to find that he had a parishioner who thought about fasting at all. Indeed, we have little doubt that Dr. Pusey and his friends would be very glad to place the duty of fasting once more under the safeguard of the Church's jurisdiction; by bringing men to the practical conviction that, whatever the Church has enjoined, no faithful son ought to neglect, without a reason which she herself has approved. Did every one fast, who had not obtained this approbation of his neglect, the precept of the Church would not be a dead letter.

Then as to "vain distinctions of meats," surely Dr. Pusey is fully aware that, in the primitive Church, pretty nearly the same distinctions existed as do now among Catholics. St. Chrysostom (*3rd Hom. to the People of Antioch*), St. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech.* 4), St. Basil (*1st Hom. on Fasting*), and Hermes, an apostolic Father (*Pastor.* l. iii.), not to quote many decrees of councils and other authorities, tell us that flesh-meat was forbidden on all fast-days. St. John Baptist did not consider distinction of meats vain, when he chose locusts and wild honey for his diet: nor did God when he instituted the old law. The rule for the English Church St. Gregory gave to our apostle St. Augustine, the same as is found in canon law. "We abstain from flesh-meat, and from all things which come from flesh, as milk, cheese, and eggs."

What is meant by "luxurious abstinences?"

That the rich will often turn into a luxury what is meant for humiliation, must not surely be cast as a reproach upon the duty, nor alleged as a sufficient motive for its abolition. Because the voluptuous, who loll upon velvet cushions in well-fitted pews, are better at ease when kneeling in church, than the poor are in their hard beds at home, should the custom of kneeling at worship be abolished? If occasionally conviviality is more indulged on a day of abstinence than becomes it, to the generality it is truly a day of restraint and penance. A Catholic can seldom invite a friend, certainly not a Protestant, to his table on those days, and is generally precluded from accepting an invitation, from others. We know Catholics, not a few, who, so far from considering fish a delicacy, from being obliged to confine themselves to the use of it on certain days, will not allow it on others to be served on their tables. And many, too, we know who, week after week, find pain in complying with the duty of abstinence. In fact, so generally has this been felt, that within these few years, the Holy See has assented to the petition of the British and Irish Catholics, for the abolition of the abstinence on Saturdays. And the dispensation thus granted, though on such a great scale, was not a "lucrative" one; for it did not put a stiver into the papal treasury.

Dr. Pusey's own Tracts afford us sufficient proof of the vast wisdom in his Church, when she "left it to every man's Christian prudence and ex-

perience *how* he should fast." The natural consequence has been that those who wish to do it, know not how. The Tract 66 is in answer to a letter by a clergyman (mark that!), who, through the *British Magazine*, desired many illustrations of No. 18. Among his queries are—"In what is the abstinence of fasting to consist?" "Is there any difference between abstinence and fasting?" The answer to this question is in these hesitating terms—"Not, I imagine, in our Church." Now, all this uncertainty, or rather ignorance, proceeds from the Anglican Church not having thought it proper to define *how* men were to fast. A very indifferently instructed Catholic would be ashamed to ask such questions—much more a clergyman.

In conclusion, Dr. Pusey finds himself obliged to answer the objection that "fasting is Popish." Of course, he denies it. He is right. It may belong to any one who chooses to practice it. Is it Anglican?

12. To the practice of fasting is joined that of other works of mortification, such as "hard lodging, uneasy garments" (hair shirts?), "laborious posture in prayer, sufferance of cold," etc., and it is called "part of the foolish wisdom of the day to despise these small things, and disguise its impatience of restraint under some such general maxim as—'that God has no pleasure in self-torture or mortification.'" (No. 66, p. 9.) These sentiments hardly call for a commentary. Few Protestants

will read them without pronouncing them popish; no Catholic without admitting their general truth.

We pass over other points of less importance, in which the defection of the Anglican Church from primitive practices is openly or tacitly acknowledged. There are one or two matters, however which we think it right to notice, before coming to our concluding remarks.

In the first place, there is constantly a desire manifested to bring the rite of ordination as nearly as possible within the definition of a sacramental institution. Thus, we are told that "ordination, though it does not precisely come within our" (*i. e.* the Anglican) "definition of a sacrament, is, nevertheless, a rite partaking, in a high degree, of the sacramental character, and it is by reference to the proper sacraments that its nature can be most satisfactorily illustrated." (No. 5, p. 10.) The difference seems to be made by the circumstance that in the other sacraments the essence lies in the words or form, while in ordination it is placed in the imposition of hands, or outward rite. (No. 1, p. 3.) This is rather a bungling view of the sacramental theory, and leads to important consequences respecting the Eucharist. Of these we shall find a proper place to speak. Dr. Pusey, in his vindication of the Tracts, goes even further; and shows that, according to St. Augustine's definition, ordination might well have been numbered among the sacraments. This definition is no other than that of our Church,—"a visible sign of invisible

grace." (Vol. iii. p. 11.) On the whole, we should conclude that the Anglican Church would have done better to have kept St. Augustine's definition. It would have acted in conformity with antiquity, and it would have better preserved the dignity of its supposed priesthood.

Secondly. The retention of ancient doctrines and rites by Catholics is clearly acknowledged. Thus, speaking of the visible Church, we have what follows:—

"Now, the Papists have retained it; and so they have the advantage of possessing an instrument which is, in the first place, suited to the needs of human nature; and next, is a special gift of Christ, and so has a blessing with it. Accordingly, we see that in its measure success follows their zealous use of it. They act with great force upon the imaginations of men. The vaunted antiquity, the universality, the unanimity of their Church, put them above the varying fashions of the world, and the religious novelties of the day. And truly, when one surveys the grandeur of their system, a sigh arises in the thoughtful mind, to think we should be separated from them. 'Cum talis sis, utinam noster esses!' But alas, A UNION IS IMPOSSIBLE! Their communion is infected with heterodoxy: we are bound to flee it as a pestilence. They have established a lie in the place of God's truth; and by their claim of immutability in doctrine, cannot undo the sin they have committed. *They cannot repent. Popery must be destroyed,—it cannot be reformed.*"—No. 20, p. 3.

This last phrase we hail with a mixed feeling of pity and satisfaction. Of pity for those who possess not the same stability as ourselves; of satisfaction at here finding a plain and manly declaration of the attitude in which we mutually stand. To us is left the blessed hope of bringing

others into unity with us by gentle arts of persuasive argument; to themselves they reserve, as an *only* resource, the ungracious work of destruction.

Thirdly. The spiritual and devotional character of the Catholic worship and religion is openly avowed. Of the approaching contest between the English Church and ours, it is said:—

> "The same feelings which carry men now to dissent will carry them to Romanism—novelty being an essential stimulant of popular devotion; and the Roman system, to say nothing of the intrinsic majesty and truth which remain in it amid its corruptions, abounding in this and other stimulants of a most potent and effective character. And farther, there will ever be a number of refined and affectionate minds, who, disappointed in finding full matter for their devotional feelings in the English system, as at present conducted, betake themselves through human frailty, to Rome."—No. 71, p. 4.

Let us now apply ourselves to drawing general conclusions from the view which we have given of these Tracts. Observe, we have only treated of their proposed return to ancient practices, now lost among the Anglicans. We resume, then, the query proposed at the beginning of our article. What has been gained by the Reformation, considered as an attempted return to primitive purity? We have here a clear confession that, upon a dozen points, affecting nothing less than the constitution of the Church, and the authority of its hierarchy, the grounds upon which the most solemn dogmas rest, the public offices of the Church, the frequent use of the Eucharistic sacrament, the performance

of daily service, the observance of fasting, and other great moral precepts, the Anglican Church, under the mask of a reformation, contrived to place things in a worse state than they were before, and than they now exist in the Catholic Church. What title can be established to the name of reformation in all these particulars?

But we fear lest, in often repeating this query, we may have been guilty of a mistake, small in itself, but more important in its results. We have spoken of our Church as the unreformed, in opposition to the Anglican, as *professing* to be reformed. By applying to ourselves the negative epithet, we only meant to speak of such reformation as led to the deplorable effects acknowledged in the Tracts to have taken place in Anglicanism. We disavow any reform among us, wrought on the principle it adopted, of destroying, or abolishing, all in which there was abuse real or pretended. No Catholic will deny that, in many matters of Church discipline, relaxation had crept into religious practices before the Reformation. The Church, in many ways, through Papal constitutions, particular synods, and chiefly by the Council of Trent, issued decrees of reform. Whoever opens the statutes of the Council will see in every sheet "Decretum de reformatione." The Catholic Church, however, went to work upon principles totally different from the Anglican. The religious orders were supposed to be lax in discipline, and open to abuses. England suppressed them, seized

their revenues, turned upon the world thousands of inoffensive men and women who had long abandoned it, and abolished the ascetic life, which the Tracts, after Bingham, acknowledge to have existed in the primitive Church. (*Records of the Church*, No. XI. p. 3.) The Catholic Church inquired into the abuses, framed the wisest regulations for their correction and prevention, and only suppressed where, as in the case of the Humiliati, real crime or gross degeneracy could be established on proof. The education of clergy was a matter much neglected in many dioceses. The English reformers took not a single step towards establishing a system of clerical education, unless it was the suppression of schools and chantries. The Catholic "reformers," at Trent, obliged every diocese to erect and maintain an ecclesiastical seminary, in which the young aspirants to the clerical state should live in community, dividing their time between study and spiritual exercises, under the watchful eye of the bishop, and persons deputed by him.

There had been grievous abuses complained of in the collation of benefices, from the pluralities accumulated on one individual, or their collation on absentees, such as officers of the papal court. The Anglicans have left all these evils, perhaps have aggravated them. They allow many benefices, with cure of souls, to devolve on one man's head: and Cheltenham, and Leamington, and Brighton, will bear testimony to the Irish rectories and vic-

arages, which allow their incumbents to live beyond the reach of their flocks' complaints. Since the council of Trent, those abuses have been completely cut off in the Catholic Church; and pluralities, with cure of souls, are totally unknown among us.

We could run on through some hundred such comparisons, to show the opposite characters of our two reforms. Ours was a *conservative reform:* we pruned away the decayed part; we placed the vessel in the furnace, and, the dross being melted off, we drew it out bright and pure. Yours was *radical* to the extreme; you tore up entire plants by the roots, because you said there was a blight on some one branch; you threw the whole vessel into the fire, and made merry at its blaze. Now that you go to look for it again, you find nothing but ashes. And you are surprised at this!

Gladly, too, would we institute a comparison between the instruments of our respective reformations. We would put St. Charles Borromeo against Cranmer, or Bartholomew de Martyrilius against Bucer; the first as agents, the latter as auxiliaries. It has often appeared to us that Divine providence was graciously pleased to give the lie to those who, under pretence of grievous abuses and errors, caused schism in the Church, by raising from its bosom, at that very moment, and soon after, such men as no Reformed Church can boast of. The tree might have been known by its fruits; an evil tree could not have brought forth such

worthy fruits of charity, of pastoral zeal, of penitential spirit, as then came to adorn the Catholic Church. And two things strike us principally in this matter. First, that they flourished exactly after the western continental Church is supposed by these Anglican writers to have set on itself the seal of reprobation, by sanctioning heresy at the Council of Trent. Nay, some among them, as St. Charles, were the most active promoters of its decisions. Secondly, that these extraordinary men were all distinguished for their attachment to this Church, and made it their glory that they belonged to it. We meet in their writings with no regrets at a single step it had taken, no intimation of a thought that it had inadvertently let slip a particle of primitive truth.

They were really a crown, aye, a crown of gold, to their mother; not as the fading garlands of Ephraim, put on the head in a moment of intoxication; they were heroes, whose names, after three centuries, are fresh in the mouths of men. Who, among the ordinary class of Anglicans, speaks of Parker, or Jewel, or Bancroft, or Cranmer, or Bramhall, as of men whose good deeds have descended in blessings on generations, or whose wise sayings are as maxims of life upon the lips of children? But such are the memories of a Francis de Sales, and a Vincent of Paul, a Philip Neri, and an Ignatius Loyola. Cities, provinces, and kingdoms, publicly testify their veneration for their memories, and their gratitude for the bene-

fits they conferred. Children, who owe their early knowledge of God and of good letters to the gratuitous education of the continent, lisp with tender affection the names of a Joseph Calasanctius, or a Jerom Emilian. Thousands of sick, whose pillows are watched with kindness by self-devoted, unpaid attendants, pronounce blessings on a Camillus de Lellis, or a John of God, or a Vincent of Paul, who inspired their successors with such charity. Has any diocese of England raised a statue to its bishop like the colossus of Arona? Has any of its cities ever honored one of its priests, as Rome has done Philip Neri, with the title of its apostle?

But this comparison between the English and the true Church, at the time when the former boasts of having risen into primitive splendor, and left the other buried in error and corruption, becomes still more striking, when made with reference to the spiritual life. Never in any period of the Church was it illustrated by persons more deeply enamored of the cross, more versed in the science of the inward life, or more sublimely occupied in contemplation, than the Catholic, at the very moment when England thought proper to abandon its unity. The writings of St. Theresa, and St. John of the Cross, not to mention the lives of such men as Felix à Cantalicio, Peter of Alcantara, Pascal Baylon, and innumerable others, are enough to have added glory to the true Church, in the brightest period of its history. One would

have supposed that a young and vigorous establishment, the phœnix-church of England, springing forth into a new life from the funeral pile where she had consumed the decayed elements of her previous existence, would have flown upwards with a steady gaze upon the Sun of justice, and given proof of her renewed vigor, by her eagle flights toward the regions of heaven. Instead of this, she fell heavily on the ground, scorched in plumage and shorn of wing, and condemned to walk or creep upon the earth's surface, and to seek her food, with dimmed eye, in its stagnant, lifeless pools. At the same time, the spirit of God seemed restless and prolific in the heart of her rival, bringing forth thoughts and aspirations which rose up heavenwards, as to their proper home, unclouded by the smallest stain that would show them to have risen from a bosom tainted by heresy and corruption.*

If, then, nothing was gained by the Protestant Reformation on behalf of good dicipline, the salutary use of the sacraments, and other such-like holy practices, nothing surely was gained in deep spirituality, and the perfection of the inward life. And if, on the other hand, the Catholic reform of the Church cleared away abuses by time intro-

*"And to what else" (than the practice of rigorous fasting) "can one attribute it, that so many men in the French Church, amid all the disadvantages of a corrupt religion, attained a degree of spirituality rare among ourselves?"—Tracts for the Times, No. 66, p. 16.

duced, leaving the good intact, so did it, at the same time, witness within it a marvellous development of the principles of divine contemplation and close union of the soul with God. That Christianity could hope for no advantage in this respect from the Reformation, is acknowledged by a late writer, whose sentiments on the German department of that awful revolution we hope on some future occasion to lay before our readers. Speaking of the ruin which it caused to the German empire, Menzel observes:—"At so high a price as this, the small gains of this measure were too dearly bought. For, whatever improvements the new Church might boast of, whatever errors and malpractices she could charge her mother or elder sister with, never will she be able to deny her the merit of having preserved and disseminated the light of divine truth and of human learning; never will she have it in her power to make out a case of necessity, or to form another path to salvation, than that on which Tauler, Thomas à Kempis, and Fenelon, have found the right way." *

We shall of course be told that the separation from the Church of Rome took place in consequence of doctrinal errors; or according to the theory of the Tracts, that, by sanctioning those errors, she separated herself from the reforming Anglican Church. Much that is connected with this question hangs upon the important one of apostolical

* Menzel, Neuere Geschichte der Deutschen von der Reformation. Breslau 1826, vol. I. p. 7.

succession, and the existence of schism in that Church. That must be laid aside for the present. But we look at the matter under another aspect.

We are told, then, that the Catholic Church had departed in matters of faith from primitive truth, and had enslaved the hearts of men to error. The charge was twofold. The Catholic Church was accused of having corrupted faith, and loaded the practices of the Church with human and superstitious usages. The Reformation attacked both. It cut off many doctrines then believed by all the Church, saying: "These are not warranted by primitive belief." It abolished almost the entire liturgy, and other services in the Church, the rites used in the administration of sacraments, and many other observances, saying: "These are human inventions."

Well, the work was done, and, God knows, thoroughly done. Nearly three hundred years roll on, the minds of men gradually cool, and they begin to discover that almost every one of the rites, ceremonies, and practices, abolished at the Reformation as superstitious additions to the primitive simplicity of worship, were, and are, most venerable, and even traceable to apostolic origin! What becomes of the other half? "Oh, there we do not yield an inch. Our reformers were certainly too hasty in dealing with outward observances. They allowed themselves to be misled. But in matters of faith, in which they condemned Rome, you must not touch them. There

all was done deliberately and wisely." Gently, good sirs: you yourselves have yielded much. You have certainly betrayed a lurking desire that ordination should be considered a sacrament. You yourselves acknowledge "that the English Church has committed mistakes in the practical working of its system; nay, that it is *incomplete* even in its formal doctrine and discipline." (No. 71, p. 27.) You concede that "though your own revolution" (here you have for once hit upon the right name) "of opinion and practice was slower and more carefully considered than those of your neighbors, yet it was too much influenced by secular interests, sudden external events, and the will of individuals, to carry with it any vouchers for the perfection and entireness of the religious system thence emerging." You have confessed that "the hurry and confusion of the times led to a settlement of religion incomplete and defective" (p. 30). You allow that your "doctrine on the Blessed Eucharist, though, on the whole, protected safe through a dangerous time by the cautious Ridley, yet, in one or two places, was clouded by the interpolations of Bucer" (p. 32).

In other words, you allow the godly work of Reformation to have been but an incomplete and ill-digested work. You see in it errors and omissions in every part; but not a fault of commission will you acknowledge. Not a single positive definition was mistaken. You have drawn a nice limit: you have traced very minutely the boun-

dary-mark. On one side you see palpable imperfections, inconsiderate rejections, unnecessary changes, excessive innovations, unwarranted interferences of the civil power, unlucky concessions to the pressure of circumstances, and, by consequence, "a system of religion incomplete and defective." But on the other side of the boundary, these same men, under the very same circumstances, without any new light, did not commit a single error. Oh no, there they were impeccable. They were repeatedly deceived when the question was about omissions—never when they adopted. They fell into constant oversights when they rejected —never once when they defined. Wonderful sagacity! Incomprehensible—far beyond the gift of infallibility, which you are so careful to disclaim for your Church! (p. 27.)

But we fancy that a prudent inquirer will ask for some better proof of this wonderful preservation than the mere assertion of these gentlemen, that their own Church "kept the nearest of any to the complete truth" (p. 29). When you acknowledge so many false steps, and allow that you have no security against others, surely men have a right to doubt whether you *have* escaped them. The Catholic Church is consistent. She says, "I am gifted with infallibility, therefore I have fallen into no errors." The Anglican rejects infallibility, but claims an equal obedience.

The argument, however, may be urged more home as thus: It will be acknowledged, and by

none more consistently than by the authors of the Tracts, that outward forms are great safeguards of doctrine, and that the abandonment of rites or observances of very remote antiquity will often endanger some point of doctrine, in connection with them. Who can doubt that the neglect of ecclesiastical censures has led to the enfeebling of Church authority among the Anglicans? Have we not heard Dr. Pusey complain that the abandonment of the exorcisms in baptism has much contributed to make men in his Church forget the power of Satan, and the might of our Redeemer? Now, to apply these principles, let us take an instance which lately struck us, on occasion of the Christmas solemnity. Let us suppose that one of the clergymen who conduct these Tracts, admiring, as he professes, the Roman Breviary, had induced several of his brethren and friends to recite its Matins together on Christmas-eve, as was usual in the ancient Church. They would find nothing objectionable in the office, but rather much possessing a sweet solemnity. For we will imagine them to omit the *Ave Maria* at the beginning, and the *Alma Redemptoris* at the end. These are their two principal stumbling-blocks. Arrived at the third Nocturn, one proceeds to read the Homily of St. Gregory upon the Gospel, as follows:—"Quia, largiente Domino, Missarum solemnia ter hodie celebraturi sumus, loqui diu de Evangelio non possumus." (*Hom.* 8 *in Evang.*)—"Since through the divine favor, we shall this day

thrice celebrate solemn Mass, we cannot speak at length on the Gospel." These admirers of primitive antiquity would have been a little staggered at such a declaration of St. Gregory's. Now, if one of them had started an objection, that such words were nonsense in the mouth of a Protestant clergyman, and that he could not feel justified in claiming anything common with a Pope who spoke such Popish language, what reply would the director make? "It is true," he would have to reply, "that appearances are against us. We must acknowledge that the Communion service at the time of St. Gregory, and even much earlier, was called the Mass. When we restored primitive Christianity at the Reformation, we wisely abolished the name. It is true that the Mass recited at that time, and even in the age of Gelasius or St. Leo, was, prayer for prayer, and ceremony for ceremony, the same as that of the Popish Missal. On the same blessed occasion, we considerately suppressed it, though probably coming from the Apostles, and substituted something better of our own. It is true that, on Christmas-day, this identical Popish Mass was then celebrated three times, precisely as it will be between to-night and to-morrow at the Catholic chapel, and by comparing the Ordo Romanus with the modern Missals, it is evident that the three masses were the same as now. For the homily we are reading is upon the Gospel, still said by the Papists at their first Mass, and cannot apply to the one Gospel preserved in

our beautiful service, from the third. This practice, though so ancient, it was the office of our godly Reformation to destroy. But what matter all these things? We have lost nothing with them. Our Communion, which we shall perform to-morrow (if a sufficient number of communicants can be got together), is the true inheritor of all these services. The Papists have been most careful to preserve the Mass just as St. Gregory celebrated it,—they have been sticklers for every word and ceremony, for the very terms and titles then used. But our Articles teach us that all such 'sacrifices of masses. . . . were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.' After such a declaration, can you doubt but that the holy Pontiff, if he again appeared on earth, would refuse to have any part in the Popish Mass, and admire and approve our beautiful communion service? Would he not say, 'It is much more probable that the Papists (as they are called in derision for their attachment to my See), who have jealously preserved every tittle of the Liturgy I sent into Britain by the hands of Augustine,—who still keep up the practices we followed in my pontificate,—have lost the true doctrine we considered embodied in that liturgy respecting the blessed Sacrament, than that the Protestants should not have retained or regained it, when they rejected almost every particle of the words and forms instituted to secure it?'"

This would really be the sort of answer to

which a Protestant might be driven on such an occasion. But every Catholic priest or layman, who read or heard those words in the Christmas office, took them in their most literal and natural sense, and saw no incongruity, no unfitness in the recital of them after 1,200 years. Perhaps some pastors commenced their sermon in the very same words, and their flocks did not see reason to consider them a quotation from any older authority.

If the curious wish came over them to ascertain whether the *things*, as much as the *names*, agree, they would open the works of Tommasi or Assemani, and find what is there given as the Mass of St. Gelasius, to be precisely the same as they heard in their own church. Could they require a stronger security that they inherited the faith of those ages, than in this cautious jealousy of their Church, preserving from destruction or alteration, the prayers, rites, and system of worship, in which this faith was deposited, recorded, and professed? Would they be reasonable, if they suspected that they alone had carefully kept the one, who had scornfully and profanely rejected the other?

But the question, how far the Reformation was a gain in religion, rises to a much higher level, when considered with reference to the grounds whereby it is justified. There are curious materials in the volumes before us, for this investigation; but they are of too great importance to be thrown together at the conclusion of this paper.

We have pledged ourselves to discuss the claims of the Anglican Church to apostolical succession. After that, we shall find leisure for examining the respective positions which we and these Anglicans now hold in the controversial warfare.

Enough has been said to abate the pretended claims of the Reformation to our esteem or admiration as a repristination of pure Christianity, a return to the practices and doctrines of antiquity. We, of course, are unable to comprehend the love and reverence with which these well-intentioned, but ill-guided, men look upon that awful revolution. They seem to speak of it as of some wisely-devised plan of improvement; for they are repeatedly praising the calm judgment or the wisdom of the Reformers, or the "Fathers of the Reformation." Contradictions, it is true, are to be found in what they write on this subject. But on the whole, they consider it as a work directed by the Providence of God, through the agency of holy men. To our minds, it presents a series of shocks and convulsions, regulated by no law but the passions of men. Like the ocean broken over its ordinary limits, the revolutionary principle sent forth wave after wave, each to destroy the sand-heap which its predecessor had raised, till, by their successive exertions, a level was at last obtained, but a level, alas! measured by "the line of confusion, and the stones of emptiness." (Isaiah xxxiv. 11, Prot. vers.) Every political ruler, King, Protector, or Queen, laid his irrever-

ent hand upon the ill-fated Church, and fashioned its plastic clergy after his own will; every divine who gained influence, changed and remodelled its services and articles according to the system he had learnt on the continent, or invented at home. It was the creature of accidents entirely destructive; not one came to fill up a breach in its walls, or to set up what another had plucked down. Devastation came upon devastation, and destruction swallowed up the traces of destruction. "Residuum erucæ comedit locusta, et residuum locustæ comedit bruchus, et residuum bruchi comedit rubigo." (Joel i. 4.) So long as there was a sound place left in the Church on which a blow could be struck, they laid them on, and spared not. It was not till every limb, from the crown of the head to the sole of the foot, had been disfigured, and no more soundness was in her, that they desisted. And now, because her wounds are healed over, and the breath of life is still in her nostrils, we are called to consider and pronounce her fair and perfect, as in the days of her youth! Because, through a special mercy, every trace of good religion was not entirely consumed,—because the desolation was not utter, as Sodom and Gomorrha's—we are invited to hail as a blessing the storm that ravaged it, and the plague that scourged it!

Sincerely must every Catholic deplore the infatuation of such as think and act in this manner. But they have a claim upon other and better feel-

ings than those of idle sympathy. Few more pernicious sacrifices have been made to the false divinities worshipped by the age, than that of denying the spirit of proselytism to be inherent in Catholicity. In the odious sense of the word, as an intermeddling, intrusive spirit, we disown it; but as a steady, unceasing desire to bring others to the possession of the same truth as we hold, a prudent yet zealous endeavor to recommend that truth by word and action, it is an essential portion of the Christian spirit of charity. Our faith, though it may remove mountains, is naught without it. Ever since these words were uttered, "We have found him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write . . . . . Come and see" (John i. 45), it has been the very essence of the apostolic, and consequently of the Christian, spirit. For our own parts, we have no disguise. We wish for no veil over our conduct. It is our desire, and shall be, to turn the attention of our Catholic brethren to the new forms of our controversy with Protestants, in the anxious hope that they will devote their energies to its study, and push the spiritual warfare into the heart of our adversary's country. That in some direction this is begun, we are able to assert. There are not wanting those who feel the insufficiency of our controversial endeavors in the past, to meet the exigencies of the present moment. And we are confident that all our excellent seminaries, at home and abroad, will use every diligence for repairing their defects. There is

much that weighs heavily upon our breasts in connection with this subject. Time, and, still more, the Divine blessing, will, we trust, enable us to develop our meaning, and to effect our designs.

"TRACTS FOR THE TIMES."

PART II.

ANGLICAN CLAIMS OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

(From the *Dublin Review* for October, 1838.)

ART. I.—*Tracts for the Times.* 3 vols. 8vo. Lond: 1833–36.

IN our first article upon the "*Tracts for the Times,*"* we reserved for future discussion the momentous question, how far the claim advanced in them, on behalf of the Anglican Church, to the rights and privileges of apostolical succession, is valid. To this task we now apply ourselves, with the full consciousness of our inability to do justice to the subject, in the confined limits of an article in a review. Gladly would we, therefore, hold back from the discussion till leisure and circumstances gave us opportunity for a more finished, as well as a more extensive, examination of the foundations of the English Church. We do not ex-

* No. 2 of this series.

press these sentiments from any regret at the pledge we have given, nor from any desire to retreat from its obligation; for we felt when we gave it even as we do now. But we were urged on by a sense of duty; and the pressure of that feeling continues yet. Not a moment's time, we seriously believe, is to be lost in fixing the attention of the Catholic mind upon the true and novel position of our controversy, with the reviving ideas of the old Protestant theology; and if we can only point out the track upon which bolder genius and deeper research than ours may follow up the attack, our duty as reviewers will have been amply discharged. For the periodical press attached to any great interest, should, we have always judged, act the part of sentinels or watchmen, giving notice of the first appearance of danger and of the approach of a new foe, to those whose office it is to man the bulwarks, and defend the walls, of their holy Sion.

The *Tracts for the Times* are forever inculcating upon their readers the belief that the Anglican Church possesses authority by apostolic descent. We will first establish this point by a few extracts, in addition to several quoted in our former article:

"We have been born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. The Lord Jesus Christ gave his spirit to his apostles; they, in their turn, laid their hands upon those who should succeed them; and these, again, on others: and so the sacred gift has been handed down to our present bishops, who have appointed us as

heir assistants, and, in some respects, their representatives." —No. i. p. 2.

"We, who believe in the Nicene Creed, must acknowledge it a high privilege that we belong to the apostolic Church. How is it that most of us are, almost avowedly, so cold and indifferent in our thoughts of this privilege? . . . For many years we have been much in the habit of resting our claim on the general duties of submission to authority, of decency and order, of respecting precedents long established,—instead of appealing to that warrant which marks us *exclusively* for GOD'S AMBASSADORS."—No. iv. p. 1.

Thus we see that, at the very outset of their publication, the tract writers are careful to inculcate this idea of the existence of a succession from the Apostles in the hierarchy of the Anglican Church, and of a consequent obligation on the part of the laity, to pay it submission and obedience. But the Tract No. 15 is entitled, "On the Apostolical Succession in the English Church." It treats of the popular objection (and a well-grounded objection we could easily prove it), that in assuming this privilege of apostolic succession, and its consequent rights, High Churchmen must recur to Rome as the fountain-head of their orders, which is inconsistent in men that reprobate "Popery." It proceeds to answer this objection, and then to give the grounds whereon the Church of England lays claim to the succession. As this tract will form the principal text whereupon we shall comment through this article, we will reserve our extracts for each part of our subject, as we shall want them. In the mean time, we will refer our readers, for farther evidence, if required, of

this determination in the Oxford divines to claim all the rights of a Church legally descended from the Apostles, to the Tracts No. 5, p. 1, and No. 7, entitled, "The Episcopal Church Apostolical," to which, likewise, we may have occasion to refer.

It is our intention to discuss the question between us and the Anglican upon this subject, independently of all inquiry into the validity of their ordinations. And this determination is the result of much serious reflection. Before stating our reasons, however, we must be allowed to protect ourselves against any misrepresentation. Let it not for a moment be imagined, that in thus waiving the inquiry into the value of English ordinations, we are prepared to admit their validity. On the contrary, our sincere and earnest conviction is, that, independent of all historical questions, they are decidedly invalid and nothing worth. We do not, therefore, sacrifice one inch of 'vantage-ground to our opponents, when we agree to put aside, in this inquiry into their pretensions to apostolic descent and jurisdiction, the question of the validity of their ordinations. It is only for the following reasons that we do so:—

First, the question of fact regarding the first Anglican consecration has lately been matter of controversy between several Catholic writers; and those of no mean reputation on either side. We wish not at present to revive the dispute. But neither do we wish to combat with arguments, the validity of which might be questioned by some of

our side. Secondly, the two inquiries, if united, would be very long; and, as each can be conducted independently of the other, we must choose one which most directly meets the theories of our adversaries. Thirdly, the ground will be more completely cut away from under their feet, if we prove that, even granting them, for argument's sake that their ordinations are valid, or were at the beginning, still they have not, nor ever had, any part in the apostolical succession, but are a schismatical Church in the fullest sense of the word; so that the works of their ministry are wholly unprofitable, and their jurisdiction none. Such are our motives for dispensing ourselves at once from entering upon the question of English orders.

In the passages above quoted, and in all others which treat of this subject in our authors, it is assumed that ordination, or imposition of hands, transmits at once apostolic jurisdiction. It is considered sufficient, to admit that the bishops of the establishment have been validly consecrated, to conclude thence that they are possessed of authority in their respective sees. Let the reader peruse the seventh tract, where he will find the simple fact of succession in a see through lawful consecration, alleged as a sufficient ground for admitting the transmission of the apostolic succession. We shall, therefore, have to inquire into two points. First, does consecration, even though valid, confer jurisdiction? secondly, what will vitiate the episcopacy of a see or province, or kingdom, so as to cut it

off from all participation in the rights of apostolical succession and jurisdiction? As the divines with whom at present we deal possess the greatest respect for ecclesiastical antiquity, and in fact agree with us that it is the judge of appeal upon such questions as the present, whereon Scripture has left us no canon or rule, we shall make it the test of their pretensions, and judge their Church, as we are conscientiously convinced it would have been judged by the fathers and councils of the first centuries.

The distinction between ordination and jurisdiction is so clearly expressed in ancient ecclesiastical regulations, that men so conversant in them as the Oxford divines cannot have overlooked it. For we read of bishops, acknowledged as such, who yet were not allowed to exercise any act of episcopal authority, not even to ordain. The council of Ephesus mentions bishops who had no churches nor any settled see; it calls them *απολιδες σχολαζοντες και εκκλησιας μη εχοντες.** When Eustathius, metropolitan of Pamphylia, had resigned his bishopric, and another had been elected in his place, it was referred to the same synod what was to be done with him; and the fathers decided as follows:—"We define it to be right and proper that, without any contradiction, he retain the name and honor and communion of a bishop; but on condition that he neither have the authority of ordaining, nor offer up sacrifice in any church by his

* In Relat. ad Cœlestin. Labb. tom. iii. col. 664.

own right; unless, for the sake of his assistance, or by way of concession through Christian love, some brother and fellow-bishop kindly permit him."*

Sozomen mentions "Barses and Eulogius (monks), who afterwards were both bishops, not of any city, but for honor only, consecrated in their monastery to reward their good actions. In which manner also," he adds, "Lazarus, of whom I have spoken above, was also a bishop."† It is no doubt true that, in general, the Church did not approve of the appointment of bishops without a see,—a practice condemned by the council of Sardica. Still were they allowed to be bishops void of jurisdiction. In the conference of Carthage (*Collatio Carthaginiensis*), Petilianus the Donatist calls such bishops phantoms (*imagines*), as opposed to real bishops (*Cardinales, et authenticos episcopos*).‡ The thirty-seventh canon of the Trullan Synod allowed bishops whose sees were in the hands of barbarians or others, and therefore inaccessible, to ordain and discharge all other episcopal functions. In commenting upon this canon, Zonaras observes that there were other bishops, who, out of mere sloth or love of ease, would not reside, nor undergo the episcopal burden, yet retained the honor and character of bishops.§ The cases of Meletius and of

* In Relat. ad Cœlestin. Labb. tom. iii. col. 805.

† H. E. lib. vi. cap. 34.

‡ Ad calcem Oper. S. Optati, p. 277, ed. Dupin. See also Christian Lupus. Ven. 1724, tom. ii. p. 73.

§ Apud Thomassinum, "Vetus et nova Ecclesiæ Disciplina," t. i. p. 97.

the Donatist bishops confirm the same point of ancient ecclesiastical doctrine. Of the latter, we shall have to mention the case later. The former is as follows:—Meletius, bishop of Lycopolis, deposed by St. Peter of Alexandria, went from place to place consecrating bishops, under pretence that he was vicar to the patriarch of Antioch. The council of Nicea took cognizance of the matter. It acknowledged the validity of the imposition of hands, but denied jurisdiction or place in the apostolical succession to such as had thus received it. It, however, sanctioned that, upon the death of any legitimate bishop, one of those consecrated by Meletius might succeed, provided he were chosen by the people, and found qualified and approved by the patriarch of Alexandria; in other words, if to the valid but illegal consecration the institution required by the ecclesiastical law was added.* And speaking of the decrees of this great council, we must not omit the eighth canon, which regards the Cathari, or Novatians. It enacts that upon renouncing their errors they shall be reconciled to the Church, and allowed to remain among the clergy. Where one of the bishops returns, the Catholic bishop shall retain his authority, and the other either retain the title, though exercising the functions of a simple presbyter; or, should the bishop not approve of having him with him, he must provide for him

* Epistola Conc. Nicæni ad Eccles. Alex. apud Labbæum, tom. ii. col. 251.

a place as chorepiscopus, or as priest. But two bishops must not be in one city.* It is not necessary to delay our readers with evidence that, on the other hand, episcopal jurisdiction was exercised by simple presbyters in former times, when deputed by proper authority, though, of course, they did not ordain, nor perform other offices requiring the episcopal character.† But what we have said is amply sufficient to prove that the reasoning of the new divines is completely false when they go about to persuade men that if their bishops were truly consecrated by imposition of hands, they became inheritors of apostolical jurisdiction. For in all the instances above given, and in others that will later come under discussion, there was no question about the validity of the episcopal consecration, or the absolute power of the consecrators to confer orders; yet still it was denied to those consecrated by them to exercise any acts of power, except by the accession of some new sanction. And this, as in the case of Eustathius, was not a deprivation, nor a punishment of crime, nor even proceeded from illegality in preceding acts, but from a clear sense that one portion of the episcopal office did not neccessarily include the other. The tract-writers constantly mix up the power of validly consecrating the Eucharist, with that of instructing or gov-

* Epistola Conc. Nicæni ad Eccles. Alex. apud Labbæum, tom ii. col. 32

† See Bolgeni, "L' Episcopato, ossia della potestá di governar la Chiesa." Rome, 1789, pp. 151, seqq.

erning (No. xv. p. 2; No. iv. p. 2); which is quite at variance with ancient doctrine and practice. Supposing, therefore, that Barlow and the others consecrated Parker, and that all was validly done as to matter and form, it does not follow that he, or those who became seised of other episcopal sees in England and Ireland, and received a similar consecration, were the lawful holders thereof, or the legitimate successors of their first bishops. It may be a case like that of the Meletian bishops, or others of which we shall speak.

Thus far we have been engaged with our first inquiry, which in fact is only a preliminary to the second. We have seen that, in the ancient Church, consecration was not considered to confer neccessarily the jurisdiction attached to apostolical succession. Our second inquiry is, "What will vitiate the episcopacy of a see, a province, or kingdom, so as to cut it off from all participation in the rights of apostolical succession and jurisdiction?"

We have seen the case of the Novatians, treated in the eighth canon of Nicea, and the decree regarding them is extremely valuable, as embodying principles acted upon most rigidly in the ancient Church. From it we are necessarily led to the conclusion that "any appointment to a bishopric, even by valid consecration, which is at variance with the canons actually in force in the Church, is unlawful, and leaves the bishop so appointed void of all jurisdiction and power; so that he is a usurper if he take possession of a see."

Novatian himself was without doubt validly consecrated by three real bishops; who are said by St. Cornelius to have performed the ceremony while in a state of intoxication, and not aware of what they were about.* He thus set himself up against Pope Cornelius, whose ordination he denied, and claimed the see of Rome. But all his acts were considered invalid, and the fathers go so far as to declare that his episcopacy was null, and that he was not consecrated.† St. Pacian, however, draws the exact line of distinction, when he calls him, "*sine consecratione legitima episcopum factum adeoque nec factum.*"‡ The bare fact, therefore, of his being duly consecrated a bishop was not sufficient, because he had not been lawfully constituted such.

The council of Nicea made the following canon: "This is generally manifest, that if any one shall have been made bishop without the consent of his metropolitan, the general council defines that he ought to be no bishop."§ Pope Innocent I. renewed the decree of Pope Siricius, "*ut extra conscientiam metropolitani episcopi nullus audeat*

* Epist. ad Fabium Alexand. ap. Euseb. H. E. lib. vi. cap. 43, ed. Valesii. The three bishops seem to have expressly consecrated Novatian to the see of Rome.

† The council of Alexandria, anno 339, says he is no bishop.—Labbe, tom. ii. col, 542. St. Cyprian reckons him among those "qui nemine episcopatum dante, episcopi sibi nomen assumunt."

‡ Epist. ii. ad Sympronianum. He likewise describes him as one "quem consecrante nullo linteata sedes accepit."

§ Can. vi. ap. Labbe, tom. ii. col. 41.

ordinare episcopum."* St. Leo the Great writes more explicitly that such are not to be considered bishops "who are neither chosen by the clergy, nor desired by the people, nor consecrated by the bishops of the province, with authority of the metropolitan."† And Pope Hilarus, speaking of the consecration of Mamertus contrary to the canons, leaves it, after severe reproof, to the metropolitan to decide, whether or no he shall act as a bishop.‡

In these, and other instances, as Bolgeni remarks, there is no question of removing or deposing; but such bishops were not supposed to have ever possessed any jurisdiction from the beginning, and consequently were not considered to be partakers of the apostolical authority transmitted by *legitimate* succession.§ Nor is this a mere inference of others, or his, but is borne out by the express testimony of ancient fathers, who clearly state that such nullity of episcopal nomination was the necessary consequence of violation of the canons in force. St. Leo, referring to the Nicene canons, says, "*infirmum atque irritum erit, quid-quid à prædictorum Patrum Canonibus discreparit.*"‖ St. Athanasius speaks of Gregory, who was intruded into the see of Alexandria in like manner; but we shall have to quote the passage later.

* Epist. ii. ad Victr. Rothomag. cap. iii. ap. Coust. Epist. Rom. Pont. tom. i. col. 696.

† Epist. clxvii. ad Rustic. Narbon.

‡ Epist. xi. ap. Labb. tom. iv. col. 1046.

§ Ubi supra, p. 168.

‖ Epist. cxiv. al. lxxxviii. ad Synod. Chalced.

An important question meets us here, and one which the reasoning of the *Tracts for the Times* throws in our way. Do the canons, the infringement of which invalidates, so far as jurisdiction goes, episcopal consecration, form a fixed code? In other words, was it only the violation of the Nicene decree that produced this effect, or the simple departure from the rules in force at any given time, such rules being variable? We say that the *Tracts for the Times* oblige us to discuss this question here, though perhaps prematurely. For, to vindicate the English Church from the accusation of schism, they quote a decree of the council at Ephesus, which, having secured the liberties of the Church of Cyprus from the usurpation of the Antiochian patriarch, generalizes its principles, and orders, that "*the rights of every province should be preserved pure and inviolate, which have always belonged to it, according to the usage which has always obtained.*" These words are thus emphatically printed by the writer, who proceeds to comment upon the canon as follows:—

"Here we have a remarkable parallel to the dispute between Rome and us; and we see what was the decision of the general Church upon it. It will be observed, the decree is passed *for all provinces in all future times*, as well as for the immediate exigency. Now this is a plain refutation of the Romanists, on their own principles. They profess to hold the canons of the primitive Church; the very line they take is to declare the Church to be one and the same in all ages. Here, then, they witness against themselves. The Pope *has* encroached on the rights of other churches, and violated the canon above cited. Herein is the difference between his re-

lation to *us*, and that of any civil ruler, whose power was in its origin illegally acquired. Doubtless we are bound to obey the monarch under whom we are born, even though his ancestor were an usurper. Time legitimizes a conquest. But this is not the case in spiritual matters. The Church goes by *fixed laws;* and this usurpation has all along been counter to one of her acknowledged standing ordinances, founded on reasons of universal application."—Vol. i. No. xv. p. 8.

How far this canon will serve the writer's turn will in the sequel perhaps appear. At present we only wish to meet the false assertions upon which his argument is based. First:—We would ask him, for it is more his affair than ours, does he, or his Church, hold that this decree is unalterable, or that the Church which made that canon may not vary its discipline at different times? If he allow that it may, then does this decree, securing to each province in perpetuity whatever rights it then possessed, prove nothing. If he maintain against us, as he seems to do, that the Church goes by *fixed laws*, and that no circumstance can sanction a variation in them, then we call upon him to be consistent, and take in the same invariable sense other canons of councils respecting bishops. Thus the general council of Nicea, in its fifteenth canon, expressly enacts that "no bishop, priest, or deacon, be translated from one city or see to another;" and that, "if, after the definition of this holy and great synod, any one shall attempt to make such translation, it shall be considered null and void, and the person must be restored to the

church for which he was originally ordained bishop, priest, or deacon."* Does the Anglican Church stand by this canon? Does the writer consider his Grace of Canterbury† and Charles James of London unlawfully possessed of their sees, and their authority void, because, in the face of this canon of a general council, translated from other sees? Yet in it we find the very qualification on which the author lays so much stress on that of Ephesus, that it regards the future; and as the Church is governed by *fixed laws*, they hold as yet. And, moreover, this canon was renewed and enforced by the council of Chalcedon in its fifth canon.‡ In like manner, the sixteenth canon of Nicea forbids the clergy to abandon their churches, that is, not to reside; and the seventeenth orders the deposition of all such as place their money at interest. Does the English hierarchy admit either of these canons to be binding?

The writer could not, surely, be serious when he maintained the unalterable nature of canons that regarded the rights of sees to independence; still less when he urged this maxim as

* Ap. Labbe, tom. ii. St. Jerome gives us the motives of this canon, *the desire of bishops to pass from poor to rich sees.* "In Nicæna Synodo a Patribus est decretum, ne de alia ad aliam Ecclesiam Episcopus transferatur: ne virginalis pauperculæ societate contempta, ditionis adulteræ quærat amplexus."—Epist. lxxxiii. ad Ocean. The fathers often represent churches as the spouses of bishops, whose unions cannot be dissolved.

† [Dr. Howley.]

‡ Ap. Labbe, tom. iii. col, 757.

maintained by Catholics. It is true that, writing for the laity, and consequently giving no references, such extracts with such a gloss will blind and perhaps captivate obedience; but one versed in antiquity could hardly have been ignorant that even such usurpations as the council of Ephesus condemns may become so established as to pass into laws and be sanctioned by canons. If he be acquainted with the history of the see of Constantinople, he would have remembered how that see, originally a suffragan of Heraclea, by a series of usurpations, obtained jurisdiction over the metropolitans of Pontus, Thrace, and Asia, which at length was approved by the general council of Chalcedon. And though, through the refusal of Pope Leo to sanction some of the canons of that synod, the arrogant pretensions of that see against the rights of other patriarchates were repressed, yet it is evident that its jurisdiction as a patriarchal see over the once *autocephalia*, or independent metropolitans above named, was from thenceforward admitted.*

But if, on the one hand, the reasoning of the tract-writer be delusive and incorrect, when he argues from any general assertion of rights in an ancient, though œcumenical, council, that such rights are unalienable (of the particular ap-

* Thomassin, tom. i. p. 38. It must be observed, too, that the independence of Ephesus (metropolis of Asia) was attributed to its having been the see of John, and consequently was as old as the Church.

plication of this case to England we shall treat later), we on the other hand are justified in concluding from this example that any jurisdiction, even though it might have been originally unjust and usurped, which any patriarchate obtained, might, by long usage and willing submission, become legitimated, and so form a part of the ecclesiastical law. For the council of Chalcedon does not *grant* but *admit* rights as already existing: "Let not the privileges of Constantinople be lost." But if we search this important matter closer, for it brings us very near our final purpose, we shall come to still more specific conclusions. For, both from the instance just given, and from the very one quoted from the Tracts, it clearly follows that the subjection to, or exemption from, jurisdiction, so completely depended upon consuetude and the actual and tolerated exercise of power, that this acquired the force of canon law. For when the legates of the Holy See had protested against the subscriptions which they thought had been artfully extorted from the Pontic and Asiatic bishops during their absence from the synod, and insisted that the very canon of Nicea, quoted by the Tracts,* should here prevail, as securing to these churches their independence, the fathers required that all who had signed the decrees in question, should say, whether they had been compelled to subscribe, or had done it of their own free will.

* Ubi supra.

In answering to this appeal, several of the bishops assign as their grounds for subjection to the patriarchal rights of Constantinople, that custom had sanctioned it. Thus Seleucus, bishop of Amasia, says: "Before me three bishops were consecrated by this see; and finding this series, I followed it, and now I have made it [the subscription] voluntarily, wishing to be under this see." Peter of Gangræ said: "Before me three were consecrated by the bishop of the imperial city, and I likewise after them. Therefore I have consented, having custom for it." Marinianus of Synnadi and Critænianus of Aphrodisia give the same reason. Eusebius of Dorylæum assigns as his motive that the pope had approved of this practice in presence of some Constantinopolitan clergy. His words deserve to be quoted:—'Εχὼν ὑπέγραψα, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ΤΟ'Ν ΚΑΝΟ'ΝΑ ΤΟΥΤΟΝ τῷ ἁγιωτάτῳ πάπᾳ ἐν 'Ρώμῃ ἐγὼ ἀνέγνων, παρόντων τῶν χληριχῶν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, καὶ ἀπέδειξα τὸ αὐτόν." Eleutherius of Chalcedon said that the see of Constantinople held its superior authority by the canons and custom.* Now certainly the canons of Nicea and Ephesus denied this assumption; and thus

* Ap. Labbe, tom. iv. col. 813–815. In reality the only canons recited as bearing upon the point were that of Nicea securing the rights of churches, and one of the synod of Constantinople, under Nestorius, which expressly acknowledges the *αὐτοκεφαλία* of Pontus, Asia and Thrace. These certainly could not be the *canons* alluded to, and yet no other canon, properly so called, could be supposed to bear upon the point.—Ubi supra, col. 811.

we find the establishment of custom prevailing in the minds of these bishops against them; and the general council acquiescing in their opinion. For the claims of Constantinople were held good, and ever after prevailed. Indeed the *canon* mentioned by Eusebius of Dorylæum could mean no more than the *rule* introduced by custom, which had thus acquired canonical authority.

The instance quoted by the Tracts is still more to our purpose. The patriarch of Antioch claimed the right of ordaining the bishops of Cyprus, or of authorizing their ordination. These oppose his pretensions and appeal to the council of Ephesus. The fathers there assembled prudently investigate the patriarch's right to interference, which they do as follows. The holy synod said, "What does the bishop of Antioch wish?"—Evagrius of Sola: "He attempts to subject our island, and seize the right of ordaining, contrary to the *canons and custom which is now ancient*." The holy synod: "Was the Bishop of Antioch ever known to consecrate a bishop in Constantia?"—Zeno of Curcium: "*From the apostles' time it cannot be shown that the patriarch of Antioch was present and ordained*, OR EVER COMMUNICATED TO THE ISLAND THE GRACE OF ORDERS, *nor yet any one else*." The holy synod: "Let the holy synod remember the canon of the holy fathers, in Nicea assembled, which secures to each church its *pristine dignity* . . . . inform us, therefore, HAD NOT THE BISHOP OF ANTIOCH THE

RIGHT OF ORDAINING YOU FROM ANCIENT CUSTOM?" —Zeno said: "We have already affirmed that he never was present, nor ordained either in the metropolis, or in any other city."* After this interrogatory comes the decree given in the Tract.†

Any unprejudiced reader, upon perusing this interrogatory, would we think conclude that had the Cyprian bishops been unable to state that till then the Antiochian patriarch had not ordained bishops in their island, such a decree would not have been granted. Twice the synod insists upon an explicit answer to this question, not to ascertain what right the patriarch put forward, nor how he supported it, but simply to learn whether or no an ancient custom prevailed, of the bishops of Antioch exerting patriarchal rights over the nomination of the Cyprian prelates. Moreover, canons and customs become ancient are put on a level, and the latter receive the same force as the former. The preamble to the decree, as given in the Tracts, confirms all that we have said; for it pronounces, "*Whereas it is against ancient usage that the bishop of Antioch should ordain in Cyprus*, as has been proved to us in this council, both in words and in writing, by most orthodox men; we THEREFORE decree that the prelates of the Cyprian churches shall be suffered without let or hindrance to consecrate bishops by themselves, and moreover, that the same rule shall be observed also in other dioceses and provinces

* Ap. Labbe, tom. iii. col. 800. † Ib. col. 801.

everywhere, so that no bishop shall interfere in another province, WHICH HAS NOT FROM THE VERY FIRST BEEN UNDER HIMSELF AND HIS PREDECESSORS." Is it not evident that the decree supposes that no patriarchal jurisdiction had existed *de facto* in that island; nay, that it sanctions the principle, that where such exercise of jurisdiction exists, it has the force of law?

The examples and authorities thus far recited lead us to these conclusions. First, the Church has, from the beginning, held that a bishop, however validly consecrated, if placed in possession of a see contrary to the canons actually in force in the Church, or by means contrary to those regulations which it considers essential to legitimate nomination, acquired no jurisdiction in or over it, and did not enjoy a part in that apostolical succession, which can only be transmitted through legitimate occupation. Secondly, that the canons appointing the forms of such legitimate occupation, or the bars thereto, were not particularly those of Nicea, but generally such as the Church agreed in, at a given time. Thirdly, that patriarchal jurisdiction is legitimated and determined by usage, and that this sanctions it with a force equal to that of canons.

Let us now come to the practical application of these principles to the case of English and Irish hierarchy. Our readers will have seen what liberal terms we have granted our adversaries in this dispute. Till now, we have allowed them to as-

sume what we could have justly denied—the validity of their orders. We are going to extend our concessions further still, *for the present.* For we are going to confine the rights of the sovereign pontiff in England to those of his patriarchate, excluding the consideration of his supremacy, to which we shall revert later. Nay, we are not unwilling even to go further still; and, if the inquiry could be thereby shortened, we would allow our antagonists the false plea of original usurpation on his part. For the cases of Constantinople, in the matter of Thrace, Pontus, and Asia, and of Cyprus *versus* Antioch, have established the principle, that possession and ancient usage constitute a right to patriarchal jurisdiction—all inquiry into its origin being waived.

Let us, therefore, suppose a general council having to decide by those *fixed laws* to which the Tracts appeal, upon the value of Anglican jurisdiction in the sees of England, and the right of the royal or parliamentary bishops to apostolical succession, denied to them by the See of Rome. Let the inquiry be conducted on the principles and in the forms used in ancient synods, such as Ephesus or Chalcedon. It might be as follows:—

The Accusation.—"The apostolic See charges these who call themselves the archbishops and bishops of the Church established in England and Ireland, with being intruders, by favor of the civil power, into the sees of those realms; inasmuch as they and their predecessors took possession thereof

in spite, and to the detriment of the patriarchal rights of that see, which, from the canons and immemorial usage, had been exercised in the nomination or approbation of all metropolitans and bishops. Up to the time of King Henry VIII. this right was perfectly acquiesced in; when, by his statute 25 Henry VIII. c. 20, the nomination was reserved by letters missive to the king, all the authority of the Apostolic See being set aside. The bishops so ordained were removed by the authority of Queen Mary, as competent to interfere in such matters as the king her father. But, moreover, what she did was with the full concurrence and approbation of this Apostolic See, which reclaimed and resumed its rights, as before acknowledged, and therefore was in exact conformity to ecclesiastical law. After which Elizabeth expelled the bishops who were in peaceable possession of their sees, with the consent of the Holy See and of the Crown; and so substituted, by her own private authority, other so-called bishops, from whom the present pretenders to apostolical succession follow and succeeded.* Such subver-

* Whoever will take the trouble of running through Godwin's book, *De præsulibus Anglicanis*, see by see, will find the following results:—Succeeded by royal appointment to sees vacant, the archbishop of Canterbury, bishops of Salisbury, Norwich, Chichester, Gloucester, Bristol, Bangor, Hereford,—eight. Succeeded by the expulsion of bishops in pacific and legal possession, never having before held the sees to which they were preferred, archbishop of York, bishops of London, Winchester, Ely, Lincoln, Lichfield and

sion of the rights long holden and admitted of this Apostolical See, and such assumption of a power never admitted in any part of the Church, were clear infringements of the canon, and constitute an act of usurpation and intrusion, which is null and void in all its consequences."

THE REJOINDER.—"The archbishops and bishops of England and Ireland reply to this charge by denying that the bishop of Rome, although he was 'the first of the patriarchs in dignity,' and 'might be called the honorary primate of all Christendom,' possessed any lawful jurisdiction in their countries. For they say, that in Scripture there is not a word to sanction the assumption on his part of such authority as he exercised for so many ages.* Hence, say they, at the Reformation

Coventry, Bath and Wells, Exeter, Worcester, Rochester, St. David's, St. Asaph's Durham, Peterborough, Carlisle, Chester,—sixteen. Retained in the see he occupied, bishop of Llandaff (*Fundi nostri calumitas*, Godw.),—one. Barlow, deposed from Bath and Wells, under Mary, was named bishop of Chichester; and Scorey, formerly of Chichester, received Hereford: as if to disprove the bold assertion of the Tracts, that, on the succession of Queen Elizabeth, "the true successors of the apostles in the English Church were reinstated in their rights!"—Tr. xv. p. 4. that a single bishop was reinstated in a see of which he had been deprived. Compare Dodd, vol. ii. p. 7.

* There is an accountable inconsistency in the appeal made by the Tract-writer to ecclesiastical decisions, while the original separation from the Holy See proceeded exclusively on the grounds, which he also lays down, that *Scripture* gives to the bishop of Rome no more authority in

'there was no new Church founded among us, but *the rights* and the doctrines of the ancient existing Church were asserted and re-established. In proof of this, we need only look at the history of the times. In the year 1534, the bishops and clergy of England assembled in their respective convocations of Canterbury and York, and signed a declaration, that the pope, or bishop of Rome, had no more jurisdiction in this country, by the Word of God, than any other foreign bishop."*

THE LAW AND PRECEDENTS.—We do not recollect a single instance in an œcumenical synod, where the decision as to the rights of the patriarch of Antioch or Alexandria to exercise jurisdiction over bishops of other countries,—as of Libya, Pentapolis, or Cyprus,—and to confirm or depose

England than it does to any other foreign bishop. The act of convocation of the province of Canterbury in 1534, the opinion of the University of Cambridge, and the king's proclamation abolishing the supremacy, omit all mention of ecclesiastical usage, and only discuss the question of divine right as granted in Scripture.—Wilkins' Concilia, 1738, tom. iii. pp. 769, 771, 772. Are these the grounds on which Ephesus or Chalcedon would have conducted the inquiry?

* It is lamentable to hear such men as compose these Tracts admitting as free, deliberate acts of the clergy what they tremblingly performed by King Henry's stern command, with the fate of Fisher and More as the alternative of refusal, what formed the sequel of a series of measures taken by the tyrant to secure possession of the object of his lust, and what the most influential members of those convocations, including the royal creature Cranmer himself, afterwards retracted.

them, was based upon the inquiry whether he had more jurisdiction *by the Word of God* than any other foreign bishop. But we have found it to be the prevailing practice, when appeal was made to general councils in matters of disputed rights (as our Tract-writers here have made), for the fathers, before proceeding to examine the question of fact, to desire those canons and precedents to be recited, which could establish the rights of parties in the case before them. We might, therefore, reasonably suppose such to be the proceeding here. The *χαθωσιωμένος μαγιστριανὸς χαὶ σηχηρητάριος τοῦ θείου χονσιστωρίου** might be supposed to read as follows:—

1. "The decrees of the Great and Holy Councils. The celebrated rule of the First Nicene Council, A. D. 325. *Let the ancient usages prevail* which are received in Egypt, etc., *as they are observed in the case of the Bishop of Rome.*"—Tr. ibid. p. 8.†

"The decree of Ephesus. 'The same rule shall be observed also in other dioceses and provinces everywhere, so that no bishop shall interfere in other provinces, *which has not from the very first been under himself and his predecessors.*'"—Ib. p. 7.

2. "Proofs of the rights of patriarchs to ordain and confirm the metropolitans, and through

* So the secretary is styled in the acts of the council.

† On the interpretation of this canon, see De la Mennais, Tradition de l'Eglise sur l'Institution des Evêques, Liége, 1814, vol. ii. pp. 81 seqq.; the work by which alone it were well if its author could be known to posterity.

them all the bishops of their patriarchate. St. Athanasius of Alexandria expressly tells us that he exercised this right by ordaining many bishops.* The Council of Nicea expressly enjoined that for any of the Meletian bishops to be raised to a see, it was necessary to have canonical election by the clergy and people, and the confirmation of the patriarch of Alexandria.† The general Council of Chalcedon decreed that the patriarch of Constantinople should have the power of consecrating the metropolitans of Pontus and Asia.‡ The celebrated epistle of Pope Innocent I. to Alexandria, patriarch of Antioch, explains the canon of Nicea as admitting this right in patriarchs. 'Whence we remark,' he writes, 'that this [patriarchal dignity] was given to Antioch not so much on account of the magnificence of the city, as because it is proved to have been the first see of the first apostle, where the Christian religion received its name, and was worthy of having a celebrated meeting of the apostles, and which would not be second to the See of Rome, but that it only enjoyed temporarily (*in transitu*) what this had the happiness to receive and fully to possess. Therefore, beloved brother, we think, that as, by peculiar authority you ordain all metropolitans, so you

* Epist. ad Dracont. ap. Hallier. de Sacris Ordin. Paris, 1636, p. 771.

† Epist. Conc. Nic. ad Eccles. Alex. Labbe, tom. ii. col. 251.

‡ Can. 28, ib. tom. iv. col. 769.

should not allow other bishops to be appointed without your permission and approbation. On which matter this will be the proper course for you to take, that you should by letters authorize such as are at a great distance to be ordained by those who now do it by their own judgment, and those who are near, if you think right, you should bring to receive consecration at your own hands.* This decree or letter assumes for its foundation the fact that the patriarch consecrated metropolitans in his jurisdiction."

3. "Proofs that the nomination of bishops, without the sanction of their respective patriarchs, were null as to jurisdiction. Hitherto we have contented ourselves with concluding that the infringement of the canon law invalidated the legitimacy of consecration. Direct proofs are not wanting to show that the want of the patriarch's assent produced a fatal flaw in the title to a see. Synesius writes that the ordinations of the bishops of Palœleisca and Hydrax were invalid, because they had not been confirmed by the patriarch of Alexandria.† Again, when the people of Olbium had elected a bishop, and three prelates, of whom Synesius was one, had given their assent, he writes to the patriarch that only his approbation was wanting to complete the work.‡ In fine, to omit

* Epist. Innoc. I. ad Alex. ap. Coustant. Epist. R. col. 851.

† Epist. 67 ad Theophil. ap. Morinum, Exercitat. Eccles. et Bib. p. 84.

‡ Ep. 76, ap. eund.

many other proofs, the eighth general council, the fourth of Constantinople, having recited the canon of Nicea, orders that *the ancient custom* be preserved, whereby the *patriarchs of Rome, Antioch, and Jerusalem might summon to council, or visit and correct all metropolitans who are promoted by them, and, whether by imposition of hands or by gift of the pallium*, RECEIVE VALIDITY IN THEIR EPISCOPAL DIGNITY."*

4. "Proofs that the Roman pontiffs were patriarchs of the West, and exercised patriarchal rights over it, England included. St. Jerome says, 'Let them condemn me as a heretic with the WEST, as a heretic WITH EGYPT, that is, with Damasus (of Rome) and with Peter (of Alexandria).'† That is, as the learned and most judicious De Marca observes, the pope is placed in the same relation to the entire West as the Alexandrian patriarch is to Egypt, that is, as its patriarch:‡ having therefore precisely as much right to exer-

* After reciting the Nicene canon, "Quâ pro causâ et hæc magna et sancta synodus tam in seniori et novâ Româ quam in sede Antiochiæ ac Hierosolymorum priscam consuetudinem decernit in omnibus conservari. Ita ut earum præsules universorum metropolitanorum qui ab ipsis promoventur et sive per manûs impositionem sive per pallii dationem episcopalis dignitatis firmitatem accipiunt, habeant potestatem, videlicet ad convocandum eos, urgente necessitate, ad synodalem conventum, vel etiam ad coercendum illos et colligendum," etc.—Conc. Labbe, tom. viii. col. 1135.

† Epist. xv. Oper. S. Hier. tom. iv. par. ii. col. 21.

‡ De Concord. Sacerd. et imper. lib. i. c. v. n. 2. Tradition de l'Eglise, tom. ii. p. 21.

cise jurisdiction in the nomination of his metropolitans; and consequently any of these is without jurisdiction if uncanonically nominated against his will. When the emperor Justinian wished to honor with a high ecclesiastical dignity the bishop of Achridus, his native place, giving it the name of *Justiniana prima*, he applied to Pope Vigilius, who erected it into an archiepiscopal and metropolitan see, assigning it a province which he took from that of Thessalonica.* And hence St. Gregory the Great expressly and directly confirms the nomination of John, elected to that see, sending him the pallium in token thereof.† Again, when Perigenes had been ordained bishop of Petras, in 418, and the people had refused to admit him, he was elected to the *metropolitan* see of Corinth, his native city. The clergy and people sent a petition to Pope Boniface I., requesting him to confirm their choice. He first sent their memorial to his vicar, the archbishop of Thessalonica, with orders to inquire into the case, and make a report thereon. Upon receiving this, the pope confirmed the election, in terms demonstrative that such confirmation was necessary for the validity of the appointment.‡ Socrates, who relates this event,

* Novell. cxxxi.

† Epist. xxii. Oper. S. Greg. tom. ii. col. 585, ed. Bened.

‡ "Cui [Perigeni] ad plenitudinem confirmationis episcopatûs sui hoc solum residet quod nostros in honore suo necdum suscepit affatus."—Epist. v. Bonif. I. ap. Const. col. 1023.

says expressly that Perigenes was named bishop by command of the Holy See."*

For proofs that the pope exercised patriarchal authority over the other countries of the West, as France, Spain, Africa, and the rest, and the parts of Italy beyond the immediate province of Rome, we must refer our readers to the great writers on these points, or to the *Tradition de l' Eglise*, where they are admirably condensed.† We pass on to precedents more immediately connected with our inquiry, which would be quoted in our supposed council.

The Church of Germany is an instance parallel to that of England, being a church formed in a country converted to the faith by missionaries from the See of Rome. St. Boniface, its first great apostle, had received episcopal consecration from Pope Gregory II. Gregory III. sent him the pallium, and empowered him to nominate and consecrate bishops "by the authority of the Apostolic See."‡ He did so, and divided Bavaria into four bishoprics; and having founded others in Franconia and Thuringia, he wrote to the pope for letters of confirmation for each bishop, which the pope readily sent them.§

We will content ourselves here with one single proof that England was considered a part of

* H. E. lib. vii. c. 36.

† Vol. ii. from p. 78 to the end of the volume.

‡ Concil. Labbe, tom. vi. coll. 1437–1468.

§ Tradit. de l'Eglise, p. 235.

the Roman or Western patriarchate; others will be better introduced later. When Constantine Pogonatus wished to convene a general council, he wrote to Pope Donus requesting him to send three legates, or if those were not sufficient, as many more as he thought proper. Agatho, Donus's successor, replied that there had been a delay in complying with the emperor's desire from the extent of the provinces whereof his council was composed. For it must be observed that besides the papal legates, the emperor had requested a deputation, consisting of about twelve metropolitans and bishops, to attend the synod, as representatives of the council of Rome, that is, of the provinces more immediately subject to his jurisdiction. Now, among the subscriptions to the synod holden at Rome on this occasion, we find that of Wilfred, archbishop of York, as well as of Felix of Arles, and other French bishops. Moreover, in their letter to the emperor, the bishops give as a reason for delay that they had hoped to be joined by "Theodore, archbishop of the great island of Britain, and a philosopher, together with other bishops dwelling in that island, and divers prelates of their council dispersed in different parts; that so their suggestions might be made by their entire council."* It is an ancient maxim of ecclesiastical law, as De Marca has observed, "Qui pertinent ad consecrationem, pertinent ad synodum;"† that

* Concil. Labbe, tom. vi. col. 685.

† De Concord. lib. i. c. vii. n. 3.

is, only those could be summoned to a synod over whom he who summons has right of consecration, the two rights, of commanding attendance and of consecrating, being commensurate. This is further proved by the canon above cited at length of the eighth general council (which even to those who do not allow it to be œcumenical, must have a weighty historical authority), in which it was stated that the *ancient custom*, which refers it to the decrees of the Nicene council, be observed, in virtue whereof the patriarch of Rome, like other patriarchs, might summon the metropolitans subject to him to a council. Seeing, therefore, that Theodore of Canterbury and other English were called and expected to attend this Roman or Western council, as forming part thereof, and that Wilfred of York, being in Rome, attended it, we may justly conclude that they were subject to the patriarchal authority of the Roman See, which summoned them. Such might be in an abridged form the recital of laws and precedents bearing upon the decision of the question.

The Interrogatory.—In the ancient synods, the laws being read, the parties were interrogated, and of course expected to give their replies according to the truth of facts. We might, therefore, suppose such questions put as formed the inquiry into the claims of the patriarch of Antioch. The synod would interrogate, and the defenders of the Anglican Church reply.

The Synod.—"Who planted the Christian re-

ligion in your country?" *The Anglican Church.* —"The venerable Bede informs us that Pope Eleutherius sent over missionaries to the Britons and converted them.* And when the Pelagian heresy had infected the island, Pope Celestine sent St. Germanus to correct and purify it." *The Synod.*—"Who communicated to your island the grace of orders?"† *The Anglican Church.*— "The holy Pope St. Gregory, who reconverted our island under the Anglo-Saxons, and established in it the episcopacy which yet remains. For he appointed St. Augustine, archbishop of London (which see he transferred to Canterbury), sending him the pallium, with power to consecrate twelve bishops as his suffragans, and another at York, who should also consecrate twelve suffragans, receiving likewise the pallium, and enjoying the dignity of metropolitan. The pope also disposes that during Augustine's lifetime the archbishop of York should be subject to him; but after the death of that apostle, enjoy independence. The two metropolitans were to have precedence according to seniority of consecration."‡ *The Synod.*—

* Historia Ecclesiastica, lib. i. c. 4.

† Conc. Chalced. sup. cit.

‡ "Usum pallii tibi concedimus, ita ut per loca singula duodecim episcopos ordines qui tuæ ditioni subjaceant; quatenus Londinensis civitatis episcopus semper in posterum a synodo propriâ debeat consecrari, atque honoris pallium ab hâc apostolicâ sede percipiat. Ad Eboracam verò civitatem te volumus episcopum mittere, ut ipse quoque duodecim episcopos ordinet, ut metropolitani honore perfruatur, quia ei quo-

"Did the bishop of Rome continue to exercise jurisdiction over the metropolitans of England and Ireland after their first establishment?" *The Anglican Church.*—"Most certainly; for Honorius I., writing to King Edwin, sends the pallium to the two archbishops, with special powers to either to name the other's successor, *in virtue of the authority of the Holy See*, in consideration of the great distance which separates England from Rome.* Pope Adrian, acceding to the request of Offa, king of the Mercians, created the bishop of Lichfield primate, subjecting to him many of the suffragans of Canterbury. The archbishop of this see submitted, however reluctantly, to the dismemberment of his province, till Leo III., better informed, acceded to the petition of the bishops, and rescinded his predecessor's decree.† During the long contests for superiority between the sees of Canterbury and York the matter was constantly referred to Rome,

que pallium tribuere disponimus, quem tamen tuæ fraternitatis volumus dispositioni subjacere. Post obitum verò tuum ita episcopis quos ordinaverit præsit, ut Londoniensis Episcopi nullo modo ditioni subjaceat. Sit verò inter Londoniæ et Eboracæ civitatis in posterum honoris ista distinctio, ut ipse prior habeatur, qui primus fuerit ordinatus."—Epist. lxv. lib. xi. Oper. S. Greg. tom. ii. col. 1163. Here we have a similar expression to the one mentioned above; the synod or council of a *metropolitan* is evidently the collection of the bishops whom he has the right of consecrating.

* Conc. Labbe, tom. v. col. 1683.

† Matt. Westm. p. 276. William of Malmesb. p. 30.

and its legates presided at the British synods held concerning their respective claims. The alternate triumphs of the contending parties were due to papal decisions in favor of one or the other.* In Ireland it was the same. St. Malachi, archbishop of Armagh, because, as St. Bernard writes, '*metropoliticæ sedi deerat adhuc et defuerat pallii usus, quod est plenitudo honoris*,' undertook a journey to Rome to obtain this distinction for himself, and for another new archiepiscopal see, the erection whereof he moreover desired to have confirmed by the Holy See.† In 1151 Eugenius III. sent four palliums into Ireland, appointing four metropolitans, to each of whom five suffragans were to be subject. This, says Hoveden, was an infringement of the rights of Canterbury, 'from which the bishops of Ireland had used to ask and receive the blessing of consecration.'‡ We acknowledge, therefore, that the See of Rome did from the beginning order our hierarchy, such as it now exists, and transfer, divide, or otherwise vary, the jurisdiction of our metropolitans." *The Synod.*—"Was the bishop of Rome ever known

* Those who wish to read a detailed narrative of these distressing disputes will find it in Thomassin, Vetus et Nova Ecclesiæ Disciplina, Par. i. lib. i. c. xxxvi. tom. i. pp. 121–126.

† In vitâ Malachiæ ap. Baron. ad an. 1137, et Thomass. ubi supra.

‡ Thomass, ibid. p. 125. We do not stay to inquire into the truth of this statement; we quote it only as a proof of the acknowledged jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff.

to consecrate an archbishop of Canterbury? . . . . Let the holy synod remember the canon of the holy fathers in Nicea assembled, which secures to *each* church its *pristine dignity* . . . Inform us, therefore, had not the bishop of Rome the *right* of ordaining you from ancient custom?"* *The Anglican Church.*—"We cannot deny that the bishop of Rome has either by himself or others ordained and confirmed our metropolitans. After St. Augustine and his immediate successors, appointed in virtue of authority from the Apostolic See, other examples occur. Thus Egbert, king of Kent, and Oswi, of Northumbria, sent Wigard to Rome, as Venerable Bede informs us, to be consecrated archbishop of Canterbury, by Pope Vitalianus; but he dying at Rome, the holy pontiff named, consecrated, and sent over Theodore, in 668.† We have evidence also of confirmation in early times, as of Justus by Boniface V., who granted the archbishop power to consecrate other bishops,‡ and of St. Dunstan, whom Pope John confirmed and appointed his vicar.§ In later times there could be no doubt that such superior jurisdiction was exercised." *The Synod.*—"Was

* Conc. Chalced. supr. cit.

† Bede, lib. iii. cap. 29. As we are treating this question on its lowest possible footing, we do not cite in the text the reason given by the two monarchs for wishing to have the archbishop consecrated at Rome,—"Quia Romana esset Catholica et apostolica ecclesia."

‡ Conc, Labbe, tom. v. col. 1658.

§ Eadmer. Hist. Nov. lib. iv.

such jurisdiction willingly submitted to, or was it disturbed by protests, complaints, or otherwise?" *The Anglican Church.*—"Although the clergy constantly complained of papal provisions, whereby vacant benefices were filled up by the court of Rome with strangers, we never read of any denial of the pope's authority to confirm archbishops, by sending them the pallium, or of his jurisdiction over them, or of his having a legate in England, who took precedence, and judged their decisions. Till the time of Henry VIII. the patriarchal privileges and rights of the Holy See were never impugned or disputed."

THE DECREE.—After hearing the parties, a decree would have to be passed, based upon the canons and usages of the Church, as applied to the case under discussion. The preamble would have to state, "That the decrees of councils secure to each church its pristine dignity, and to the patriarchates their established jurisdiction; That ecclesiastical authority had ever held those episcopal nominations of no value, towards conferring apostolical succession or place in the hierarchy, which were made in contravention of the canons in force in the Church; That these canons, as established by *long usage*, gave to the Holy See the *right* of nominating or confirming the metropolitans of England; That the order of bishops now existing in England, even supposing the validity of their orders, were instituted and appointed, the bishop of Rome not only not consentient but repugnant

thereto, and vehemently condemning the same as an infringement of his immemorial rights, secured to him by the canons and customs become ancient." Therefore, the synod, unless it turned its back upon all former decisions of the Church, and all its standing laws, would be obliged to decide: "That the bishops, who now hold by authority of law the sees of England, have not, and never have had since the Reformation, any ecclesiastical, hierarchical, or apostolical succession, authority, or jurisdiction whatever in matters religious or spiritual; That they are not the inheritors or successors of those who held the sees until that time; That consequently they are, in the eyes of the Church Catholic, intruders, usurpers, and illegitimate holders of the same."

Such must have been the decision of an ancient synod, had the validity of Anglican claims to apostolical succession or ecclesiastical authority been proposed to it; and such is the judgment to which any one conversant with the principles of ecclesiastical antiquity and law, and willing to abide by them, must likewise come. Whatever pre-eminence, privilege, or jurisdiction, the civil legislature of the country can bestow upon its functionaries, and whatever, in such capacity, it may have bestowed upon the ministers of the English Church, we willingly allow and will pay them. Whether it be to frank a letter, or give probate to a will, to commit a poacher, or to vote in a House of Lords, let them enjoy it; we envy and grudge

them not. But believe there is benediction in their blessings more than any other man's order or consecration in the laying on of their hands more than of a layman's, we do not and cannot, without renouncing all respect for antiquity, and all veneration for our fathers in the faith.

After our clear exposition of our motives we shall not, of course, be suspected of having yielded too much, or placed the rights of the Holy See upon too low a ground. We have certainly given up much. We have discussed the matter as one of ecclesiastical right rather than of divine; and have shown that even thus the jurisdiction and succession claimed by the Tracts for their church is null. But, in fact, it would be in our power to show that such rights as the Apostolic See held, and yet does hold, over the episcopacy of the Church, are not of ecclesiastical origin, but belong essentially to the chair of Peter, as granted to it by our Lord Himself. This leads us to another and a much higher ground on which to base any resistance to the pretensions of the English Church and its upholders to be an apostolical establishment, or "a branch," as they choose to call it, "of the Catholic Church:" a ground, too, which still dispenses with all inquiry into the validity of Anglican ordination. We mean THE STATE OF SCHISM into which it put itself at the Reformation, and which at once acted as a blight upon all its ecclesiastical powers, withering them, and rendering them incapable of any act of valid jurisdiction,

or any place in the apostolical succession. This portion of our argument, with many other matters connected with this subject, we reserve for our third article upon the Tracts. We shall treat it by the light of ecclesiastical antiquity, and exhibit instances curiously parallel with that of the Anglo-Hibernian establishment.

But there is an argument, or objection, or insinuation, in the Tract so often alluded to, that calls for our notice before concluding this portion of our task. It consists in the remark quoted above, that the bishops appointed by Mary were usurpers, and that "on the succession of Queen Elizabeth, the true successors of the Apostles in the English Church were reinstated in their rights." As we are in our "granting vein" today, we are disposed, for argument's sake, to suppose that the bishops put into the English sees under Mary *were* intruded, though the canons in force in the Church and in England, till Henry violated them, were observed in their appointment. And even so we ask, WHO deposed them? WHO reinstated the others? WHO *were* reinstated? for these are matters requiring ample explanation, before any but the rude and simple will acquiesce in the assertion of the writer. WHO removed Mary's, or rather the Roman pontiff's, bishops? Did the English Church? Who formed this church, if the sixteen deposed bishops did not? But what act was there that could be called an act of the English Church, removing one arch-

bishop and fifteen bishops, leaving *one* in his see, omitting another (Coverdale) who had been deposed by Mary, and placing *two* others in sees which they had not before occupied? Parker, the new metropolitan, could not be said to reinstate, nor to form the hierarchy, not being himself consecrated. And if, as these writers pretend, at the Reformation a return was made to the ancient rules, and the Anglican Church only vindicated its rights as accorded to every church by the early councils, let them show us the canons whereby the deprivation of bishops, and the appointment of new ones by letters missive, are granted to the civil rulers. But we will easily show them those whereby the election of a metropolitan is reserved to his synod or provincials; and we will prove to them that it was a mutual understanding between the Holy See and temporal princes which granted to the latter, in modern times, the power of nomination, subject to confirmation from the former. Let them be, therefore, consistent. If they allow the authority of Elizabeth to act as she did, let them admit that of Mary to act similarly; and, moreover, let them give us their warrant for such authority in the ancient Church to which they appeal. If they consider it to have been a usurpation in Elizabeth "of the iron hand, and of the iron maw," as some of them have called her, then is their entire hierarchy based upon an unjustifiable and tyrannical act of power, and they who com-

pose it are intruders. They are *not* shepherds who enter in by the door. It is precisely the case of Gregory, whom the emperor Constantius thrust into the see of Alexandria, the true bishop yet living; of whom St. Athanasius thus writes: —"His reason for thus acting was, that he was neither consecrated according to the ecclesiastical canon, nor called to be a bishop according to apostolical tradition; but sent from the palace with a military force and pomp, as though he had received a civil magistracy."* Such, if judged by the ancient laws of the church, and in fact were the Anglican prelates, named contrary to apostolical tradition, ordained contrary to the canons of the Church, nominees of the palace, thrust into the sees of bishops first imprisoned and deposed by the arm of secular power, and willing to receive episcopacy as though it had been a mere civil dignity. And so, in truth, it is;—they have received but a civil magistracy. And hence the Council of Sardica pronounced Gregory to be no true bishop, deposing him from the place to which the secular arm had raised him.† We think it needless to urge our last question, WHO *were* reinstated? for the answer is plain,—NOT ONE. Kitchen of Llandaff was not,—for he had never been removed. Barlow and Scorey were not,—for they never took possession of the sees in which alone they could

* Epist. ad Solitar. n. 14.

† Epist. Synod. ad Eccles. Alex. ap. Labbe, tom. ii. col. 667.

have kept up succession. Parker and the new creation were not,—for they had never been bishops, nor held sees, before.

But let us follow up the inquiry into the matter upon those principles which have guided us through this article—the laws of the Church as displayed in its conduct. Bassianus, having been consecrated bishop of Evazi against his will, refused to proceed thither. Upon a vacancy in the see of his native city, Ephesus, he violently thrust himself into it, and kept peaceable possession of it for four years. After this period, Stephanus, a priest of the same church, assisted by a party, seized his person, and was elected bishop in his place to all appearance by the consent of the province. The case, between these two claimants for the metropolitan see was heard and decided by the Council of Chalcedon in its eleventh action. Bassianus was charged with irregularity, in having been translated from his former see. He replied that he had never been lawfully appointed, and had never gone to it; and that Basil, successor to Memnon, who had violently consecrated him bishop, had recognized the illegality of the act, and restored him "the place and communion of a bishop;"* another proof of episcopal rank without jurisdiction. He was then called on to state who gave him possession of his see. He acknowledged that only one bishop of the province was there; who, however, when appealed to, stated

* Conc. Labbe, tom. iv. col. 687.

that he was compelled by a mob to give him institution. Here was a manifest irregularity, sufficient to vitiate the appointment, as he himself acknowledged. However, he had interposed a plea that he had been acknowledged and confirmed by Proclus, patriarch of Constantinople. The judges ask the Constantinopolitan clergy there present to inform the council if this were true. Theophilus, one of them, replied that it was; and that Proclus had communicated with Bassianus, as bishop of Ephesus. The tables now seemed turned; and Stephanus was called on to prove how Bassianus had been removed (*ἀποκινηθέντα*). We see, therefore, that the confirmation by the patriarch had the force of canonical institution, and even compensated irregularities and violations of the canons in the election. What authority, then, was greater even than this, and could reverse its decisions? *That of the Roman pontiff.* Stephanus thus replies:—"The matter was referred to the patriarch of Antioch by the emperor Theodosius of blessed memory, who wrote thither. Letters were likewise brought from the most blessed pope, the most holy bishop of Rome, that this man should not be a bishop: and the letters are evident."* This is certainly a strong proof of what we reserve

* *Ἀνηνέχθη παρὰ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τῆς Αλεξανδρέως πόλεως, τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Θεοδοσίου τοῦ βασιλέως γράψαντος ἐκεῖ· ἀνηνέχθη δὲ γράμματα καὶ παρὰ τοῦ μακαριωτάτου πάπα τοῦ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἁγιωτάτου ἐπισκόπου ὥστε τοῦτον μὴ δεῖν εἶναι ἐπίσκοπον· καὶ φανερά ἐστι τὰ γράμματα.*—Ibid. col. 694.

for fuller demonstration in our next article, that the holy Roman see exercised control over the decisions of patriarchs in their own jurisdictions, without demur on their parts. The sentence of the pope was definitive, and again annulled the decision and confirmation of the patriarch.

Lucianus, bishop of Byziæ, and some other bishops, interposed in favor of Bassianus, urging once more that his nomination had been validated by the *confirmation* of Proclus (*βεβαιῶσαι τὴν τούτου ἐπισκοπήν*). The answer of Stephanus was short and pithy:—"The most holy Archbishop Leo of Rome deposed him because he was made contrary to the canons."*

What was the result? That Bassianus was declared an intruder, and possessed of no right to the see of Ephesus. But was Stephanus on that account considered his lawful substitute, and allowed to retain the metropolitan chair? By no means. To have proved the person deposed a usurper, did not by any means justify his nomination, or heal any irregularities in it. *Upon the motion, therefore, of the papal legates*, it was decided that neither of these should keep possession of the see; but that a new election should be proceeded to, and a pension allowed from the revenues of the bishopric for the maintenance of the two deposed bishops, who should keep the title and communion of bishops.† In like manner, therefore, even if the Catholic bishops nominated

* Conc. Labbe, tom. iv. col. 698. † Ibid. col. 700.

under Mary could be proved intruders, no argument would result in favor of the Elizabethan creation; as the link is absolutely wanting which could alone give them any claim upon succession to those who, before such imaginary intrusion, held our metropolitan and episcopal sees.

"TRACTS FOR THE TIMES."

PART III.

THE CATHOLIC

AND

ANGLICAN CHURCHES.

[From the *Dublin Review* for August, 1839.]

ART. VI.—*Tracts for the Times.* 4 vols. 8vo. London: 1833-38.

WE must refer our readers back to our tenth number for the commencement of the subject we are about to continue.* In our former article we examined, by the light of antiquity, the claims advanced by the Oxford divines, in favor of apostolical succession in their church. In order to simplify the controversy, we made concessions till we almost feared we might have scandalized our brethren. We wished to take up the controversy upon the lowest imaginable grounds, and for this purpose we made the following liberal allowances.

* No. 5 of this series.

First, we put aside all question respecting the validity or invalidity of ordination and consecration, in the Anglican Church.

Secondly, we entirely considered the case of this church as one to be investigated by canonical enactments, overlooking the great point of ecclesiastical and doctrinal union with the universal Church, which is essential, *jure divino*, for the legitimate existence and exercise of hierarchical authority.

Thirdly, we limited the rights of the Holy See to be a party to the lawful appointment of bishops in England, to those of the patriarchate, instead of considering those of its supremacy.

Fourthly, we even imagined the hypothesis, that the rights exercised by the pope, as patriarch of England, had no better foundation than usurpation at the outset.

After making all these abatements in our just assumptions, we proved that the advocates of the Anglican Church could not sustain any claim on her part to a share in apostolical succession. But it was not by any means our intention to leave the investigation there. On the contrary, we promised to raise the question to a higher level, and discuss our adversaries' pretensions, or rather repel them, upon considerations involving most serious consequences. The following extract from our former article will at once explain our actual position, and define the point from which the present starts:—

"After our clear exposition of our motives, we shall not, of course, be suspected of having yielded too much, or placed the rights of the Holy See upon too low a ground. We have certainly given up much. We have discussed the matter as one of ecclesiastical right, rather than of divine; and have shown that, even thus, the jurisdiction and succession claimed by the Tracts for their church is null. But, in fact, it would be in our power to show that such rights as the Apostolical See held, and yet does hold, over the episcopacy of the Church, are not of ecclesiastical origin, but belong essentially to the chair of Peter, as granted to it by our Lord himself. This leads us to another and a much higher ground on which to base any resistance to the pretensions of the English Church and its upholders, to be an ecclesiastical establishment, or 'a branch,' as they chose to call it, 'of the Catholic Church,' a ground, too, which still dispenses with all inquiry into the validity of Anglican ordination. We mean THE STATE OF SCHISM into which it put itself at the Reformation, and which at once acted as a blight upon all its ecclesiastical powers,—withering them, and rendering them incapable of any act of valid jurisdiction, or any place in the apostolical succession. This portion of our argument, with many other matters connected with this subject, we reserve for our third article upon the Tracts. We shall treat it by the light of ecclesiastical antiquity, and exhibit instances curiously parallel with that of the Anglo-Hibernian establishment." *

We hardly consider it necessary, for the adversaries whom we are combating, to prove that a Church, placed in a state of schism, at once forfeits all right to the lawful exercise of its hierarchical functions. All the examples quoted in our former articles, and the abundant testimonies which we shall give in this, will sufficiently prove that, according to the principles of the ancient Church, a

* Supra, p. 195.

state of schism is a state of sin, of outlawry and deprivation; and that, even where ecclesiastical functions might be *validly* exercised, they cannot be so, either lawfully or salutarily. The bishops of a schismatical church could not be admitted to vote or deliberate at a general council, nor be present, save as accused or accusing parties; they could not be allowed to communicate with other bishops without first retracting their schismatical principles; and, upon returning to the unity of the Church, they would require to be formally reinstated into their sees; or would be removed to others, or remain suspended. In fine, it is only in the true Church of God that apostolical succession can be had; and any one, who, even maintaining the integrity of faith, held not to unity of communion, was anciently reckoned to be out of that Church. "Nobiscum estis," writes St. Augustine, "in baptismo, in symbolo, in cæteris Dominicis sacramentis: in spiritu autem unitatis, et in vinculo pacis, in ipsa denique Catholica Ecclesia nobiscum non estis."*

The paragraph which we have extracted from our former article pledges us to the painful duty of proving that the Anglican Church is fundamentally and essentially a schismatical church, and, as such, has no right to a place in the apos-

* "You are with us in baptism, in the creed, in the other sacraments of the Lord; but in the spirit of unity, in the bond of peace,—in fine, in the Catholic Church itself,—you are not with us."—Ad Vincent. Rogat. Ep. xciii. al. xlviii.

tolical succession. Now, though we thus advance to a closer position with our adversaries than in our last argument, yet we are aware that we are by no means going to the extent to which we have a right. Is the English Church *only* schismatical? Is it not as truly heretical? We unhesitatingly reply, Yes. The one state cannot easily exist without the other. St. Jerome clearly distinguishes the two, but at the same time draws this conclusion, of how naturally one runs into the other. "Inter hæresim et schisma," he observes, "hoc esse arbitrantur, quod hæresim perversum dogma habet; schisma, propter episcopalem discessionem, ab ecclesia separatur. Cæterum nullum schisma non sibi aliquam confingit hæresim, ut recte ab ecclesia recessisse videatur."* And so, likewise, St. Augustine:—"Schisma [est] recens congregationis ex aliqua sententiarum diversitate dissensio; hæresis autem schisma inveteratum."† That is to say, seldom will schism fail to justify its separation from the Church by departing from its doctrine, and so insisting that the supposed errors, which it abandoned, obliged it to separation. In this way does the Anglican Church plead doctrinal

* In Epist. ad Tit. c. iii. "This they suppose to distinguish heresy from schism,—that erroneous doctrine constitutes heresy, while schism is a separation from the Church by the secession of bishops. However, no schism fails to frame some heresy, to justify its departure from the Church."

† The same saint, writing against Gaudentius, says:—"Cum schismaticus sis sacrilega discessione, et hæreticus sacrilego dogmate."—Lib. ii. c. ix.

necessities for its schism,—and that very plea proves heresy. But in our argument on the subject of apostolical succession, we are willing to consider the separation as simply schismatical; in the same manner as we speak of the Greek Church, which is, in truth, heretical. The fact is, that we can fully attain our purpose with the more lenient charge for our basis, and therefore prefer it. The case of heresy in the Church of England can, indeed, be summarily made out, on the simple ground of its having rejected the decrees of an œcumenical council. Still it might be considered necessary to go into details of doctrines to establish the point to full satisfaction. At the same time the Fathers make no distinction between heresy and schism, as a ground of forfeiture of the rights belonging to the true Church, of which jurisdiction is one. Once more let us hear the great Doctor of the Western Church:—"Credimus et sanctam ecclesiam, utique Catholicam. Nam et hæretici et schismatici congregationes suas ecclesias vocant: sed hæretici de Deo falsa pronunciando, ipsam fidem violant; schismatici autem dissensionibus iniquis a fraterna charitate dissiliunt, quamvis ea credant quæ credimus. Quapropter nec hæretici pertinent ad Ecclesiam Catholicam quæ diligit Deum; nec schismatici, quoniam diligit proximum."*

*S. Aug. De Fide et Symb. c. x. tom. vi. p. 161. "We believe the holy, yea, the Catholic Church. For heretics likewise and schismatics call their congregations churches:

From the passages we have already given, it must sufficiently appear what is the distinction between the two states, the one supposing error in faith, the other separation from unity. Now, in investigating the position of the Anglican Church, in regard to the latter, we wish strictly to adhere to the method we employed in our former article; and so to examine it by the light of antiquity, and judge it entirely by the rules laid down and determined by the fathers of the primitive Church. Such, in fact, is the standard by which the divines with whom we deal desire to be measured; and it is a satisfaction to us to have this point, at least, of complete agreement. We shall, therefore, take a case from the history of the early Church, which we consider parallel, even to an extraordinary degree, with that of the English Establishment; from it we shall learn what were the criterions by which the fathers of the ancient Church judged of a case of schism, and what the manner in which they expressed their sentiments concerning it. We shall, moreover, hear the objections brought by the schismatics, and the answers given to them.

No schism longer, or more extensively, afflicted the Church, or gave rise to more interesting dis-

but heretics, by speaking falsely of God, violate faith; and schismatics, by wicked dissensions, depart from fraternal charity, although they believe what we believe. Wherefore neither heretics belong to the Catholic Church, which loves God; nor schismatics, because she loves her neighbor."

cussions, than that of the Donatists in Africa; and we, therefore, select it as an illustration of the controversy between us and the Anglicans.

The Donatists, although they received their name from Donatus, schismatical bishop of Carthage, yet dated from the intrusion of his predecessor, Majorinus, consecrated by several bishops, while Cæcilianus held the see; on the ground that the latter was disqualified from holding it, because his consecrators had delivered up the sacred volumes to the persecutors. These Donatist bishops, seventy in number, assembled in council, at Carthage, with Secundus, of Tigisi, primate of Numidia, at their head, wrote to the churches of all Africa a synodical letter, in which they declared the consecration of Cæcilianus to be schismatical, and refused to communicate with him.* Here, then, we have a strong case, in the supposition that each national church has an independent existence. A large body of bishops, headed by the neighboring primate, steps in to examine an election, charged with grievous irregularities, and pronounces a sentence, which is communicated to all the rest of the African Church. They consider Cæcilianus as an intruder, and appoint Majorinus in his place. A large portion of the African Church assent to their sentence, and from henceforth consider the latter as the legitimate arch-

* S. Aug. in Breviculi Collationis, cap. xiv. Oper. tom. ix. p. 569. Auct. lib. cont. Fulgentium Donatist. cap. xxvi. Ibid. Append. p. 12.

bishop, and refuse to hold communion with the former. On the other hand, many continue to consider Cæcilianus as true bishop of Carthage, and remain united with him in communion.

But, before examining how this complicated state of things was resolved, we must not omit to say a few words concerning the unhappy passions that led to this schism; the reader, we think, will be as struck as we have always been, with their exact resemblance to those that produced the separation of England from the communion of the Church. St. Optatus sums them up in these words:—"Schisma igitur illo tempore confusæ mulieris iracundia peperit, ambitus nutrivit, avaritia roboravit."* The first of these causes was the anger of a powerful woman, called Lucilla, who could not brook the discipline and reproofs of the true Church.† She thought it, therefore, advisable to excite a schism, and with money and influence encouraged those bishops who were already inclined to cause one. Who does not here see a remarkable coincidence with the case of Anne Boleyn and her fautors,‡ who, seeing that the discipline of the Church would not admit of her

* St. Optatus de Schism. Donatist. lib. i. cap. xix. ed. Dupin, p. 18. "The schism, therefore, was at that time bred by the rage of a disgraced woman, was nourished by ambition, and strengthened by covetousness."

† Id. c. xvi. She had been reprehended by Cæcilianus for superstitious devotion to unauthenticated relics.

‡ "Cum omnibus suis potens et factiosa femina, communioni misceri noluit."—Ib. c. xviii.

impious designs, brought about, as the first cause, the king's awful separation?—"irascenti et dolenti," as St. Optatus writes, "ne disciplinæ succumberet." The second cause of the schism was ambition; in Africa, that of some who sought to obtain the episcopal dignity; in England, that of Henry, who desired to possess the supremacy of the national church. The third was covetousness, in both cases, of the wealth of the Church. A considerable quantity of church plate and ornaments had been deposited in the hands of some leading men among the clergy and people, by the Deacon Felix, from fear of persecution. These they appropriated to themselves, and when called on by Cæcilianus to restore what was not theirs, preferred to become schismatics, so to retain possession of their ill-gotten wealth. A very similar desire to enrich themselves by the plunder of the Church, and appropriation of the accumulated wealth of ages, will easily be recognized as the chief corroborator, in powerful men among the laity and clergy, of their wish to depart from the unity of faith.

The foundations of the schism thus laid, it became every day more and more complicated in its operation. For the number of bishops who maintained it was very considerable, and spread over the whole of Christian Africa to such an extent that many dioceses were entirely in their hands, and the Catholics, in some districts, were exceedingly few in number. The Donatist be

came so powerful as to take forcible possession of churches, and seize upon the property and persons of the Catholics. Hence the civil power found it necessary to interfere, and send deputies into Africa, to repress the extravagances, and chastise the excesses, of these desperate men. This only led to their having a new boast, that of confessors and martyrs, titles which they readily gave to all that suffered for crimes connected with the schism.* Many of the questions of fact, as we learn from St Augustine, became, in course of time, involved in obscurity; such as the true case of Cæcilianus's consecration, and his real character; so that, in truth, it had become difficult for a simple individual to unravel the matter, or decide for himself to which party he ought to belong. The Catholic pastors, therefore, exerted themselves by every means in their power to point out such simple arguments as would at once convince the most illiterate with whom they ought to side. These we shall proceed to present to our readers.

In the first place, they generally treat with the Donatists as with schismatics, and not heretics. It is a question, whether these men insisted upon the erroneous doctrine generally attributed to them, of having rebaptized those who had

* See, for instance, the Acts of Marculus, written with all the pathos of those of the true martyrs, and those of Maximian and Isaac, first published by Mabillon, and republished in St. Optatus's Works, p. 193, seq. Macrobius was the Fox of the Donatists.

been baptized by heretics, whether such truly, or only in their judgment. St. Augustine quotes Tichonius, of whom we shall later speak, as assuring us that, in 330, a council of two hundred and seventy Donatist bishops condemned the practice; and as appealing to witnesses still living in 380.* The same father acquits them of any error respecting the Trinity, although Donatus himself is supposed by him to have had some erroneous opinions concerning it. St. Optatus clearly acquits them of errors in faith, thus writing to Parmenianus:—"Bene clausisti hortum hæreticis, bene revocasti claves ad Petrum, etc. .... Vobis verò schismaticis, quamvis in Catholica non sitis, hæc negari non possunt, quia nobiscum vera et communia sacramenta traxistis. Quare cum hæc omnia hæreticis bene negentur, quid tibi visum est, hæc et vobis negare voluisse, quos schismaticos esse manifestum est? vos enim foras existis."† Hence, this saint always calls Parmenianus by the title of brother; and when this was indignantly rejected, vindicates it at length in the opening of his fourth book. Once

* Ep. xxxix.

† Lib. i. c. xii. p. 12. "Rightly hast thou closed up the garden to heretics, rightly hast thou claimed the keys for Peter .... But to you schismatics, although you are not in the Catholic Church, these things cannot be denied, because you have taken the true sacraments in common with us. Wherefore, since these are all rightly denied to heretics, why have you thought that there is any wish to deny them to you who are schismatics? For you have gone out."

more he repeats, that the Donatists are brethren, because they possess the same sacraments.*

2ndly. The Donatists, as well as their adversaries, claimed the title of the Catholic Church. The general body of them (for we shall see that an important modification of their principles on this head was later introduced among them) maintained that the Catholic, that is, the true, Church, only existed among themselves, and cut off from its pale all who were not in communion with them.† At the celebrated conference of Carthage, held by order of Honorius, in 411, between the Catholic and Donatist bishops, the former headed by St. Augustine, the latter by Petilianus, the schismatics were exceedingly indignant that the title of *Catholic* should be exclusively claimed by, and given to, the other side. On the third day of the conference, when the moderator Marcellinus called the orthodox by this name, Petilianus rose and said, "Only that side is the Catholic which shall carry off the victory in this contest."‡ But, throughout the conference, the Catholics strove in vain to bring their opponents to the point, as to who had a right to be

* Cap. ii. p. 72. However, St Augustine occasionally calls them heretics, as Cont. lit. Petil. lib. i. c. i., where he says, "Donatistarum hæreticorum." He again argues the point more fully, Cont. Crescon. Gram. lib. ii. cap. iv.

† "Eam [Ecclesiam] tu frater Parmeniane, apud vos solos esse dixisti."—S. Opt. lib. ii. cap. i. p. 28.

‡ Gesta Collat. Carthag. diei 3, cxlvi. ad calc. Oper. S. Opt. p. 305.

considered the true Church; and it may be worth while to extract a few passages from the Acts to show how similar the mode of argument pursued on both sides is to what would be pursued in a modern debate between Catholics and Protestants.

"Fortunatianus, bishop of the Catholic Church, said, 'Explain the grounds of your separation and dissension from the universal Church spread over the entire world.'" After some tergiversation, being once more pressed by Fortunatianus, "Petilianus, bishop, said: 'That the Catholic Church is with me our pure observance of the law, and your vices and crimes establish.'" He then goes off to other matters irrelevant to this question. Later, when Marcellinus once more gives the title of Catholic to the anti-Donatist side, Petilianus again demands that the Acts should give his party the same title. Marcellinus replies that he gives that name to one party, because the imperial decree bestows it; and then Petilianus answers that till the present contest is decided, it will be to them but an empty name. "He shall obtain it," he adds, "who, at its conclusion, shall be found truly a Christian."* Emeritus, another Donatist bishop, spoke in the same strain. St. Augustine had urged the necessity of being in communion with the Church, which the Scriptures proclaim must be diffused over the entire world, "whose communion," he adds, "we appear to hold, but

* Cesta Collat. Carthag. diei 3, cxlvi. ad calc. Oper. S. Opt. p. 299.

which is falsely charged by you with grievous crimes." To this Emeritus replied, that whoever is truly a Christian, he only is Catholic, and can claim the name, and, that though it is by a sort of prescription borne on the forehead by the other party, yet it should be placed between the two as the reward of the victors.* This speech of Emeritus contains another plea, presenting a curious resemblance to the reasoning of the Tracts, to which we may later allude.

3rdly. In addition to this desire to claim an equal right with their opponents to the name of Catholic, we must notice the desire on the part of the Donatists to disclaim *this* name,† or to fasten a similar one on the Catholics, just as that of "Romanists," or "Papists," is in vain applied to us by Protestants. Thus Petilianus, in the same conference, said:—"Donatistas nos appellandos esse credunt cum si nominum paternorum ratio vertitur, et ego eos dicere possum, immò palam aperteque designo Mensuristas et Cæcilianistas esse."‡

"* Quicunque justis legitimisque ex causis Christianus fuerit approbatus, ille meus est Catholicus, illi hoc nomen imponitur, ille debet sibi hanc regulam vindicare; quamvis ipsa Catholica, quæ nunc pro præscriptione partis adversæ quasi in fronte quadam rite adversum nos temperari cognoscitur, medium esse debet; et in judicio ita constitui, ut hoc nomen victor accipiat."—Ibid. p. 301.

† The Tracts disavow the title of Protestant as applied to the Anglican Church. Vol. iii. p. 32. See also Mr. Newman's "Letter to Dr. Faussett," 2nd edit.

‡ "They think that we ought to be called Donatists; whereas, if account has to be taken of parental names, I

Let us now see how the fathers argued on the other side, and what broad, clear, and simple arguments they choose, to convict the Donatists of the crime of schism; to prove to them that they belonged not to the Church of Christ, that is, to the Catholic Church, but must be content to bear the title which at once designated them as separatists, and followers of men, and not of God.

I. The first, the most frequently, and the most earnestly urged of these arguments, is the fact of the Donatist Church, however numerous its bishops and its people, being excluded from communion by other churches, and not being admitted by them within the pale of the true Church. And this, as we shall see, is not an argument based upon right, but upon fact:—it does not require, in the opinion of the fathers, any previous examination into which party was right; the very fact of one's being in communion with foreign churches, and the other's not, was considered a decisive proof that the latter was necessarily in a state of schism. They lay down as principles that the true Church of Christ was to be dispersed over the entire world, and that consequently, no national church could claim for itself the distinction of being this only true Church. Thus reasons St. Optatus: "Ergo Ecclesia una est . . . . . Hæc apud omnes hæreticos et schismaticos esse non potest. Restat ut uno loco sit. Eam tu, frater

could call them, yea, I do openly and publicly call them, *Mensurians* and *Cæcilianists*."—Ibid. p. 296

Parmeniane, apud vos solos esse dixisti . . . . . Ergo ut in particula Africæ, in angulo parvæ regionis, apud vos esse possit; apud nos in alia parte Africæ non erit? In Hispaniis, in Gallia, in Italia, ubi vos non estis, non erit?"* He then enumerates other countries in which the Church existed, that held not communion with the Donatists; and reasons upon the texts of Scripture, which promise the entire earth to Christ as His kingdom. Now, the reasoning here is twofold, and in two ways applicable to modern controversy. In the first place, it attacks the foolish presumption of those who would maintain that the Anglican Church is the only apostolic one, the only true Church of God, in consequence of the corruption of every other in communion with the Holy See. This is a common boast, of which it can hardly be necessary to bring examples to any reader versed in controversy. The argument of Optatus, grounded upon Scripture testimony, denies at once the possibility of any national church being exclusively the true one, and those over the world that are in communion being false. Secondly, this reasoning strikes as much at the theory of the Tracts, and other High-Church writings,

* "Therefore, the Church is one . . . . It cannot be with all heretics and schismatics. It must, therefore, be only in one place. Thou, brother Parmenianus, hast said that it is with you alone. Therefore, as it may be with you in a small portion of Africa, in a little corner of the land, with us, in another part of Africa, it is not? In Spain, in Gaul, in Italy, where you are not, it is not?"—Lib. ii. cap. i. p. 28.

which would fain have us consider the Church of Christ as an aggregate of many churches, holding indeed different opinions and practices, and not actively communicating together; so that the Anglican Church may be called "that branch of Christ's Church which is established among us," and the Church of Rome be allowed to be a portion (though a corrupt one) of the same Church of Christ. This system is directly at variance with the argument of St. Optatus: "Restat ut uno loco sit." He does not imagine the possibility of Donatists being considered a part of the true Church; if *they* constitute it, the rest of the world is excluded: if Spain, Gaul, and Italy, which are in mutual communion,—Donatist Africa is shut out from the pale.

St. Augustine's reasoning on this subject is precisely the same. We think it needless to quote passages from him, wherein he maintains the universality of the Church, and that only that can be the true Church which is dispersed over the whole earth; because it would be difficult to read many pages of his writings against the Donatists without meeting a commentary on one of these or similar texts:—"In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." "I will give thee the nations for thine inheritance," etc. "He shall rule from sea to sea, and from the river to the bounds of the earth."

Upon these texts he insists against Parmenianus, against Petilianus, and against Cresconius,

as sufficient to prove that the churches in communion must be true, to the exclusion of all that stand in separation from them. However, the texts, which we shall have occasion to quote, will put the sentiments of this most learned doctor beyond all question. In fact, we must now see the pleas whereby the Donatists justified their state of separation from communion with the rest of the world; and we shall see how exactly they resemble those of Protestants, and how they were met by this great Father.

1. First, they argued that the corruptions of the Church were such as rendered it impossible for them to keep in communion with it. This was the common plea of all schismatics. St. Jerome tells us that a Luciferian, disputing with a Catholic, "asserted that the entire world belonged to the devil, and, as it is their wont to say, that the Church was become a house of wickedness."* Parmenianus in like manner affirmed "that the Gauls, the Spaniards, and the Italians and their friends, by whom he must understand the entire world, resembled the African *Traditors* by participation in their crimes, and companionship in their guilt."† "Hence," he concluded, "that the

*"Asserebat quippe [Luciferianus] universum mundum esse diaboli, et, ut jam familiare est ipsis dicere, factum de Ecclesia lupanar."—Dialog. adv. Lucifer. cap. i. tom. ii. p. 173, ed. Vallars.

†"Gallos, et Hispanos, et Italos, et eorum socios [quos ubique totum orbem vult intelligi] traditoribus Africanis commercio scelerum, et societate criminum dicit esse consimilem."—August. cont. Epist. Parmen. lib. i. cap. ii.

whole world had been contaminated by the crime of surrendering the sacred books, and other sacrileges."*

This language resembles not a little that of the book of Homilies regarding the corruptions of the Church before the Reformation. But the resemblance between the ancient and modern schism is, on this point, still stronger. The Donatists went on to say that there came, at that time, godly men, who bore witness against the prevarications of the Church, and urged those certain provinces to purge out the foul abuses that had crept in, and separate themselves from those among them that adhered to them, and consequently from those foreign churches who kept communion with these. "Dicit enim legatione functos quosdam, sicut ipse asserit, fidelissimos testes ad easdem venisse provincias, deinde geminato adventu sanctissimorum, sicut ipse dicit, Domini sacerdotum, dilucide, plenius ac verius publicata esse quæ objiciunt."† "Frustra dicit Parmenianus 'damnatos in Africa traditores in con-

*"Dicit Parmenianus hinc probari consceleratum fuisse orbem terrarum criminibus traditionis, et aliorum sacrilegiorum."—Ibid. cap. iii.

†"He says that most faithful witnesses, as he calls them, acted as ambassadors to those provinces, then by the repeated arrival of most holy priests of the Lord, as he says, these things which they object were clearly, more fully, and truly published."—Ib. c. ii. The first witnesses may represent the foreign Reformers; the second class corresponds to Cranmer, Ridley, etc.

sortium damnationis acceptos a provinciis transmarinis.' "*

Now, the answer which the Fathers make to this excuse for separation, is such exactly as we make, and is perfectly applicable to the case between us and the Anglican Church. They put against it at once the promises of Scripture, that the universality of God's Church should never fail, and made it a question between the authority of God and of men, whether those promises could fail, or not rather the testimony of men be false. "Homo putans sibi magis credi debere quam Deo," St. Augustine calls the man who makes that argument. "Quid, quæso te," he asks, "quid per ipsos fideles testes quos vultis Deo esse fideliores, quid publicatum est? An quia, per Afros traditores, semen Abrahæ quod est Christus, non est permissum venire usque ad omnes gentes, et ibi exaruit quo pervenit? Dicite jam magis collegis vestris credendum esse quam Testamento Dei."† We would willingly extract the entire paragraph,

*"In vain does Parmenianus say, that the Traditors condemned in Africa were received into fellowship of condemnation by the provinces beyond the seas."—Ib. cap. iv.

†"A man who thinks he ought to be believed rather than God." . . . ."What, I ask you, what was published by these faithful witnesses, whom you make more worthy of credit than God himself? That, through the African traditors, the seed of Abraham, which is Christ was not permitted to come to all nations, and was dried up where it had reached? Say at once, that we must believe your colleagues more than God's Testament."—Ib. cap. ii.

which is most apposite and conclusive for our case. St. Jerome makes use of a similar argument from the Scripture promises. "If Christ has not a Church, or has it only in Sardinia, he has become too poor; and if Satan possess Britain, the Gauls, the people of India and barbarous nations, and the entire world, how have the trophies of the Cross been bestowed upon one corner of the whole earth?"*

But the reasoning of the Fathers is sometimes closer and more to our purpose even than this They propose to the Donatists the same dilemma as we, in our controversy, do to Protestants. Either the Church was so corrupted before your Reformers came, that it had ceased to be the Church of God, or not. If it was, then had Christ's promises failed which secured perpetuity to His Church; if not, whence did those who separated from it derive their authority for this purpose, or how could any act or teaching of theirs make it cease to be what it was before? The following passage of St. Augustine is to this effect:—"Quod si erat etiam tunc Ecclesia, et hæreditas Christi non, interrupta, perierat, sed per omnes gentes augmenta accipiens permanebat, tutissima ratio est in eadem consue-

* "Si Ecclesiam non habet Christus, aut in Sardinia tantum habet, nimium pauper factus est. Et si Britannias Gallias, Indorum populos, barbaras nationes, et totum semel [*simul*] mundum possideat Satanas, quomodo ad angulum universæ terræ Crucis trophæa collata sunt?"—Ubi sup. No. 15, p. 186.

tudine pepmanere quæ tunc bonos et malos in una complexione portabat. Si autem tunc non erat Ecclesia, quia sacrilegi hæretici sine baptismo recipiebantur, et hoc universali consuetudine tenebatur; unde Donatus apparuit? de qua terra germinavit? de quo mari emersit? de quo cœlo cecidit? Nos itaque, ut dicere cœperam, in ejus Ecclesiæ communione securi sumus, per cujus universitatem id nunc agitur quod est ante Agrippinum, et inter Agrippinum et Cyprianum, per ejus universitatem similiter agebatur."* Here, then, it is taken for granted, that the very fact of any practice being followed or tolerated in the Church is a sufficient vindication of it; and, that, whenever a separation takes place from the body of the Church on the ground of such being corruptions, those are safe who adhere to the portion that perseveres in those practices, while the pre-

* "But, if the Church then was, and Christ's inheritance had not perished by being interrupted, but, receiving increase through all nations, yet endured, it is the safest principle to persevere in the same practice which then united in one embrace the good and the evil. But, if at that time there was no Church, because sacrilegious heretics were received without [repetition of] baptism, and this was the universal practice, whence did Donatus make his appearance? from what earth did he spring up? from what sea did he emerge? from what heavens did he fall? We, therefore, as I had begun to say, are secure in the communion of that Church, through the entire of which that is now practised, which, in like manner, was practised through it entire, before Agrippinus, and between Agrippinus and Cyprian."—De Baptismo cont. Donatistas, lib. iii. cap. ii.

tended reformers are at once to be rejected, as having no mission or commission, for their schismatical undertakings. The same Father uses the same argument on other occasions. For instance, in his treatise "De unico Baptismo," he writes as follows:—"If that be true which these men assert, and by which they endeavor to maintain or excuse the cause of their separation, namely, that the fellowship of the wicked in the same sacraments defiles the good, and that, therefore, we must separate ourselves bodily from the contagion of the evil, lest all should together perish;* it clearly follows, that at the time of Stephen and Cyprian, the Church had perished, nor was any left to posterity, in which Donatus himself could be spiritually born. But if they consider it impious to say this, for in truth it *is* impious, then as the Church remained from these times to the times of Cæcilianus and Majorinus, or of Donatus, . . . so could the Church remain after this latter period, which, increasing through the entire world, as had been foretold of her, the particular crimes of any traditors or other wicked men could not defile. . . . There was no reason, therefore, but it was an act of the greatest madness, for these men, as if to avoid the communion of the wicked, to have sep-

* How often do we see and hear applied to those in communion with the Catholic Church those words: "Go out from her, my people, that you be not partakers of her sins, and that you receive not of her plagues."—Rev. xviii. 4.

arated themselves from the unity of Christ, diffused over the entire world."*

The passages hardly require any comment; any reader of ordinary judgment, will see how St. Augustine must, upon his principles, have judged the case of the English Church, if it put in the plea of justification, which the great body of its defenders do, that the absolute corruptions of the foreign churches with which it had before been in communion, as well as of those at home, who resolved upon keeping up that communion, made it imperative on her to refuse communion without their reformation. For he takes it for granted; first, that before such a call on them was made, these aggregated churches constituted the true unfailing Church of Christ; secondly, that if a particular church, such as the African or the British,

* "Si ergo verum est quod isti dicunt, et unde causam suæ separationis asserere vel excusare conantur, in una communione sacramentorum mali maculant bonos, et ideo corporali disjunctione a malorum contagione recedendum est ne omnes pariter pereant; jam tunc Stephani et Cypriani temporibus constat periisse Ecclesiam, nec posteris derelictam, ubi Donatus spiritualiter nasceretur. Quod si dicere nefarium judicant, quia revera nefarium est, sicut mansit Ecclesia, ex illis temporibus usque ad tempora Cæciliani et Majorini, sive Donati, ... sic potuit et deinceps Ecclesia permanere, quam toto, sicut de illa prædictum est, terrarum orbe crescentem nullo modo poterant quorumlibet traditorum ac facinorosorum alien acrimina maculare . . . . Nulla igitur ratio fuit, sed maximus furor, quod isti velut malorum communionem caventes, se ab unitate Christi quæ toto orbe diffunditur separarunt."—De unic. Bapt. cont. Petil. c. xiv.

called upon them to make changes, or by making such, separated itself actually or virtually from their communion, they could not thereby lose their prerogative, but remained what they were before: thirdly, that it was safe to remain in communion with these rather than with the separating church; fourthly, that if Cyprian (still more, if Berengarius or Huss), with some, protested against a practice, held in his time by the great body of the Church,* it could not thereby cease to be what it was before, nor could any portion of the Church plead in excuse of its separation any such decision; but such a portion at once became involved in the guilt of schism and all its entailed forfeitures. These principles, if applied to modern controversy, will go a great way towards deciding the respective positions of the Catholic and Anglican Churches.

2. But it may perhaps be said, that the case between us and Protestants is by no means so simple as that of the Donatists and the Catholics of their times, but that the decision as to a case of schism must depend upon the examination of the points of difference. Now to this we reply, that by the Fathers, who combated the Donatists, the question was essentially considered one of fact rather than of right; that is to say, the very circumstance of one particular church being out of the aggregation of other churches, constituted these

"* Multi cum illo [Stephano] quidam cum isto [Cypriano sentiebant."—Ibid.

judges over the other, and left no room for questioning the justice of the condemnation. St. Augustine has a golden sentence on this subject, which should be an axiom in theology. "Quapropter SECURUS judicat orbis terrarum, bonos non esse qui se dividunt ab orbe terrarum, in quacumque parte orbis terrarum."* This principle he repeats in fuller terms on another occasion: "Inconcussum igitur," he writes, "firmumque teneamus, nullos bonos, ab ea [Dei Ecclesia] se posse dividere; id est, nullos bonos, etiamsi cognitos sibi malos patiantur, ubicumque versantur, propter se a longe positis et incognitis bonis temerario schismatis sacrilegio separare; et in quacumque parte terrarum vel facta sunt ista, vel fiunt, *vel futura sunt*, ceteris terrarum partibus longe positis, et utrum facta sint, vel cur facta sint ignorantibus, et tamen cum orbe terrarum in unitatis vinculo permanentibus, ea ipsa sit firma securitas non hoc potuisse facere, nisi aut superbiæ tumore furiosos, aut invidentiæ livore vesanos, aut sæculari commoditate corruptos, aut carnali timore perversos."†

* "Wherefore, the entire world judges WITH SECURITY, that they are not good, who separate themselves from the entire world, in whatever part of the entire world."—Cont. Epist. Parmen. lib. iii. cap. iii.

† "Let us, therefore, hold it for an unshaken and stable principle, that no good men can separate themselves from it [the Church]: that is, that although they may have to endure evil men, known to themselves, no good men, wherever they may be, can, on their own account, separate, by the rash sacrilege of schism, from the good living far off and unknown

Here, then, is a general rule applicable not merely to the Donatist case, but to all future possible divisions in the Church. Those cannot be possibly right who have separated themselves from the communion of distant churches, which remain still connected in the bond of unity. Whatever plea may be set up, of corruptions or abuses, the true ground of separation will be one of those pointed out by the great St. Augustine. And, in truth, who does not acknowledge that the "haughty fury" of Henry VIII., the "worldly advantage" of his and his son's "corrupt" nobility, and the "carnal fear" and time-serving policy of a "perverted," heartless clergy, who had not the courage to follow More and Fisher to the scaffold, produced and promoted the first schismatical separation of England from the communion of other churches dispersed over the world?

3. The principles thus far laid down, on the authority of the ancient Church, meet not only the reasoning of the ultra-Protestants, but also those of the High Church, or Oxford school. For they maintain, that, although throughout the

to them. And, in whatever part of the world this has been done, or is done, *or shall be*, while the other distant parts of the earth are ignorant that it has been done, or wherefore it has been done, and yet continue in the bond of union with the rest of the world; let this be considered quite certain, that none can have so acted, unless they had been, either furious with swelling pride, or insane with livid envy, or corrupted by worldly advantage, or perverted by carnal fear."—Ib. cap. 5.

middle ages, the Church in communion with Rome, was, in spite of her errors, the true Church because she had not sanctioned them by any positive decree, yet she forfeited her title, and became heretical, when at the Council of Trent she did so.* Now this was precisely the argument of the Donatists, which we have seen combated by St. Augustine. They allowed that, at the time of St. Cyprian, the Church in communion with Pope Stephen was true and orthodox, though the same evil principles and abuses existed which they so severely reproved; but no sooner did the body of foreign churches formally adopt and approve these mal-practices, and the erroneous maxims on which they were grounded, than they fell into a state of heresy and schism. Now we have seen St. Augustine put this case, and demonstrate that either the church failed in the first instance, and so was lost, and, with it, lawful sacraments and orders; or else that this could not be admitted in the second. We have seen how any one church, in one

* "True, Rome may be considered [heretical] now; but she was not considered heretical in the first ages. If she has apostatized, it was at the time of the Council of Trent. Accordingly, acknowledging and deploring all the errors of the middle ages, yet we need not fear to maintain that, after all, they were but the errors of individuals, though of large numbers of Christians."—Tract xv. p. 10, where, in a note, the opinion of Gilpin is quoted, with approbation, that after that epoch, "it seemed to him a matter of necessity to come out of the Church of Rome." This is perfectly the Donatist view of the case.

portion of the world, could not possibly be allowed to be right, while protesting against the union of other churches over the rest of the world. The very fact of its being in such a position at once condemns it, and proves it to be in schism. Still it may be both interesting and instructive to pursue this inquiry still farther, and see this particular plea more closely examined. For it so happened that the Donatists, like the modern Anglicans, asserted that they were not the separatists, but that the other churches were. These are their words:—"Si vos tenere Catholicam dicitis, Catholicos illud est quod Græce dicitur unum sive totum. Ecce in toto non estis, quia in partem cessistis."* To this St. Augustine, on this occasion, contents himself with first explaining the meaning of the term "Catholic," to wit, that which is extended over all the world, and then by throwing ridicule on the extravagance of the assertion. "How can we be separatists," he asks, "whose communion is diffused over the entire world? But, as if you were to say to me, that I am Petilianus, I should not know how to refute you, except by laughing at you as in jest, or pitying you as insane;—I see no other course now. But as I do not think you were joking, you see what alternative remains."†

* "If you say that you have the Catholic Church, καθολικὸς is, in Greek, 'one,' or 'whole.' Behold, you do not constitute the whole, since you have seceded apart."—Cont. Liter. Petil. lib. ii. cap. 38.

† "Sed quemadmodum, si mihi diceres quod ego sim Petilianus, non invenirem quomodo refellerem, nisi ut aut jo-

On another occasion, the same holy father gives a decisive criterion, whereby it may be determined who went forth from the Church, or who were, in other words, the violators of Catholic unity. It was not long before the Donatists split into innumerable sects; the usual consequence of departure from unity. But the account of this division is so well given by St. Augustine, and so accurately describes the vicissitudes of modern, as well as of ancient, schism, that we must be allowed to quote his words:—"Eadem pars Donati in multa minutissima frusta conscissa est, quæ omnes minutissimæ particulæ hanc unam multo grandiorem in qua Primianus est, de recepto Maximiniastarum baytismo reprehendunt, et singulæ conantur asserere apud se tantummodo verum baptismum remansisse, nec omnino esse alibi, neque in toto orbe terrarum, qua Ecclesia Catholica expanditur, nec in ipsa grandiore parte Donati, nec in ceteris præter se unam ex minutissimis particulis."* If for the "pars Donati" we

cantem riderem, aut insanientem dolerem; hoc mihi nunc faciendum esse video; sed quia jocari te non video, vides quid restet."—Ibid.

* "The very sect of Donatus is divided into many very minute parts, every one of which minute parts blames this much larger one, in which Primianus is, for having received the baptism of the Maximinianists; and each one endeavors to maintain that true baptism has remained in it alone, and is nowhere else, neither in the entire world, over which the Catholic Church is spread, nor in the larger sect itself of Donatus, nor in any other except itself, one of the said most minute parts."—De Baptis. cont. Donatistas, lib. i cap. ii.

substitute the Anglican Church, what a faithful picture we have of the minute subdivisions of separatism into which dissent from her has broken, every one of which denies to the others sound doctrine,—as the Donatists did baptism,—as well as to the original branch of which they are the boughs, and to the great trunk of Catholic and apostolical descent from which both it and they have been lopped off.

But to come to our point, which is, the criterion suggested by St. Augustine for determining who are the separatists and schismatics. It is this:—You have no difficulty in deciding that these different sects separated from you, and not you from them (as they pretend); because, while *primitive* Donatism is commensurate with them all, each of these prevails more in one than in another province: the Rogatenses, for instance, in Cæsarean Mauritania; the Urbanenses in some parts of Numidia; and so forth. This criterion would apply to the Anglican Church. For some parishes are comparatively free from dissent; and there is no portion of England, however occupied by it, in which that Church is not found: then some sects, as the Quakers, are unknown in some districts, while they are abundant in others; different classes of Methodism, Unitarianism, or Moravianism, have their favorite districts, in which their teachers and followers more abound. And as the Anglican Church occupies all the space subdivided among them all, we justly conclude that

they all went forth from it, and not it from them. In like manner, observes this learned father, we see one heresy infest one country, and another another; each sect has its own territory,—for where it has sprung up, there, being of its nature unprolific, it lies till it withers up. But the Catholic Church occupies the whole world, taking in the very countries in which the respective sects exist, surrounding and compenetrating them; and, therefore, by parity of argument, this is proved to be the true Church, from which all they are separatists and schismatics.* This argument is at

*"Contra universitatem vero Ecclesiæ, quia te inania repetere libuit, etiam hic tibi respondeo. Sicut in Africa pars Donati vos estis, a quibus apparet partem Maximiani schisma fecisse, quoniam non est per Africam, qua vos estis, vos autem et in regionibus in quibus illa est non deestis, nam et alia schismata facta sunt ex vobis, sicut Rogatenses in Mauritania Cæsariensi, Urbanenses in quadam Numidiæ particula, et alia nonnulla, sed ubi præcisa sunt ibi remanserunt. Et hinc enim apparet eos a vobis exiisse, non vos ab ipsis, quia vos etiam in his terris ubi ipsi sunt, illi autem quaquaversus vos estis non nisi forte peregrinantes inveniuntur. Sic Ecclesia Catholica, quæ, sicut ait Cyprainus, 'ramos suos per universam terram copia ubertatis extendit,' ubique sustinet scandala eorum qui ab illa, vitio maximæ superbiæ præciduntur, aliorum hic, aliorum alibi atque alibi. . . . .Ubi enim cadunt, ibi remanent, et ubi separantur ibi arescunt, *unde ipsa de qua præciduntur etiam in eas terras extenditur, ubi jacent illa in sua quæque regione fragmenta:* in illa vero, singula, quacumque distenditur, non sunt, quamvis aliquando vix rarissima folia ex eorum ariditate ventus elationis in peregrina dispergat."—Cont. Crescon. lib. iv. cap. 60.

once simple and conclusive. It supposes, what is of great importance in our controversy with the Oxford divines, the possibility—nay, the necessity—of the Church Catholic having members, in countries under a schismatical hierarchy, who communicate with the rest of the Catholic world; a point on which we shall have later to speak: "Ipsa [Ecclesia] de qua præciduntur, etiam in eas terras extenditur ubi jacent illa quæque in sua regione fragmenta." Let us, then, apply the argument to our times. We see the Lutherans occupying the northern parts of the European continent, the Calvinists Switzerland, the Presbyterians Scotland, the Anglicans England. Not one of these has a church, properly so called,* in any other country; none in Spain, or Italy, or France, or Southern Germany, or South America, or Syria, or China. "Ubi cadunt, ibi remanent." But we, that is, the Church wherewith we are in communion, extends over the whole of the world, occupying, extensively, several of these countries, and having large bodies of Christians in others. And even where those Protestant sects prevail, congregations and numerous flocks are found communicating with the one Church spread over the world. And what we have said of Protestant countries, we may extend, as St. Augustine does, beyond the Donatists, to other heresies, as the

* The small number of Protestants in France or Piedmont are not in communion with any other "fragment," but form independent sects.

Nestorians and Eutychians in the East. For almost wherever these are, Catholics exist; but they are not to be found except as strangers, *nisi forte peregrinantes*, in countries entirely Catholic. We see, then, how simple, and yet how efficacious, is the test proposed by St. Augustine, for deciding whether the English Church be a seceder, or not, from Catholic unity.

At the same time, we cannot forbear quoting another criterion proposed by the other Father, whom we have already copiously cited,—St. Jerome. His words are strikingly applicable to our present case. We will give them in the original. "Poteram diem istiusmodi eloquio ducere, et omnes propositionum rivulos uno Ecclesiæ sole siccare. Verum quia jam multum sermocinati sumus. . . . brevem tibi apertamque animi mei sententiam proferam, in illa esse Ecclesia permanendum, quæ ab apostolis fundata usque ad diem hanc durat. Sic ubi audieris eos qui dicuntur Christi non a Domino Jesu Christo sed a quoquam alio nuncupari, ut puta Marcionitas, Valentinianos, Montenses, seu Campitas;* scito non Ecclesiam Christi sed Antichristi esse synagogam. Ex hoc enim ipso quod postea instituti sunt, eos se esse indicant quos futuros Apostolus prænunciavit. Nec sibi blandiantur, si de Scripturarum capitulis videntur sibi affirmare quod dicunt, cum et diabolus de Scriptura aliqua sit locutus, et Scripturæ non in legendo

* These were the names by which the Donatists of Rome were distinguished.

consistant sed in intelligendo."* Now, though this criterion will, in most special wise, apply to those sects which bear the names of men, as Lutherans, Calvinists, and Wesleyans; yet will it be found applicable no less to any, whose designation indicates a state of separation from the rest of the Church. For, the new Oxford school will not easily persuade men that their Anglican Church forms no part of the great *Protestant* defection, a title which at once expresses separation and opposition to that greater aggregation of churches dispersed over the whole world, on which no efforts have succeeded in fixing any different title beyond that of the *Catholic*.

4. But the Donatists endeavored to escape from the application of this test by another sophistry.

* "I could occupy the entire day with this subject, and dry up all the driblets of [schismatical] propositions by the sun of the Church alone. But since our discourse has been long. . . . . I will briefly and clearly lay you down my opinion, that we must remain in that Church which, founded by the apostles, endures unto this day. Wherever you hear those who are called Christians, receive their name not from the Lord Christ Jesus, but from some one else; as, for instance, the Marcionites, Valentinians, Montenses, or Campites, know that they are not the Church of Christ, but the synagogue of Antichrist. For, from the very fact of their being of later institution, they show themselves to be those whom the apostle foretold. Neither let them flatter themselves, if they appear to prove what they say, by text of Scripture; seeing that the devil cited passages from Scripture, and Scripture consists not in the reading, but in the understanding of it."—Ubi supr. *in fine*.

You, they said, are no more universal or Catholic than we. A great part of the world is still heathen,* and much is occupied by sects which you do not admit into the pale of the Church. Or rather sometimes the Donatists affected to believe that Catholics readily admitted the latter into communion with them, in order to enlarge their grounds to claim that title.† To this St. Augustine replies, that heathen nations will gradually be converted, and that, to the end of the world, room will be left for the dilatation of religion and the fulfilment of God's promises regarding the propagation of the faith. With regard to the other objection, he observes that we do not admit any who differ from us in faith into religious community; but that these, like the Donatists, are in different countries unprolific, and confined within certain limits, beyond which they have no power to spread, so as to put in a title to be considered the Church Catholic.‡ We see here two impor-

* "Omitto gentium barbararum proprias regiones, Persarum ritus, sidera Chaldæorum, Ægyptiorum superstitiones." —Crescon. ap. Aug. cont. eumd. lib. iv. cap. 61.

† "Non ergo nobis communicant sicut tu dicis, Novatiani, Ariani, Patripassiani, Valenitinani," etc.—Ibid.

‡ "1. Unde necesse est, non solum fœcunditate nascentis Ecclesiæ, verum etiam permixta multitudine inimicorum ejus, per quos pietas ejus exerceri et probari posset, usque in finem judiciariæ separationis totus orbis impleatur. . . . 2. Veruntamen ubicumque sunt isti [hæretici] illic Catholica, sicut in Africa, ita et vos: non autem ubicumque Catholica est, aut hæresis quælibet illarum. Unde apparet quæ sit

tant points decided; first, how the Catholicity of our Church is not hemmed in by the many unconverted nations yet remaining, inasmuch as they are rather a field on which the Catholic prerogative of propagation and fecundity is to be exercised till the end of time; and, secondly, how the Catholic Church, then, as now, sternly excluded from its communion all sects that differed from it, instead of making the Catholic Church consist, as the tract-writers would desire, of the heterogeneous amalgamation of various churches differing in doctrine; as the Greeks, Syrians, and Anglicans, with the many harmoniously united in communion with Rome.* On another occasion we find St. Augustine answering the other form of the second of the rehearsed objections; namely, that the number of sects not in communion with those that call themselves the Catholic Church, excluded this from that title: "Quomodo," asked Cresconius, "totus orbis communione vestra plenus est, ubi tam, multæ sunt hæreses, quarum vobis nulla communicat?"† To this the saint replies,

arbor ramos suos per universam terram extendens, et qui sint rami fracti non habentes vitam radicis, atque in suis cuique jacentes et arescentes locis."—Ibid.

*See, for example, Tr. viii. p. 4, where the churches of Rome, Holland, Scotland, Greece, and the acknowledgedly heretical churches of Asia, are enumerated as forming so many parts of the Church Catholic.

† "How is all the world full of your communion, while there are so many heresies, not one of which communicates with you?"—Cont. Cresc. lib. iii. cap. 66.

as on the other occasion, tacitly acknowledging the fact of non-communion with heretics, but still maintaining the universality of the Catholic Church.

5. Only another subterfuge remains: it is, that to belong to the universal Church, it is not necessary to be in *active* intercourse and communion with the different parts that compose it; so that the Anglican Church may be a portion of Christ's Church Catholic, although it has no actual badges to show of amity and harmony with other portions of the same Church in Europe or the East. Cresconius, the Donatist, made use of precisely this principle, which is necessary to the establishment of the system maintained, on this subject, by the Oxford divines: "Non communicat Oriens Africæ, nec Africa Orienti."* To this St. Augustine replies, that, "with the chaff, that is out of the Lord's barn-floor, the East does not indeed communicate, but with the Catholic wheat, and with the straw that is within, the East does communicate with Africa, and Africa with the East."† The Donatists seem to have wished to maintain the independence of the African Church, as requiring no direct connection with the churches of Asia. Hence, on another occasion, where St. Augustine

* "The East does not communicate with Africa, nor does Africa with the East."—Ibid. cap. 67.

† "Non sane sed in paleis hæreticis ab area Domini separatis: in frumentis autem Catholicis et interioribus paleis omnino communicat Oriens Africæ, et Africa Orienti."—Ibid.

had a friendly conference with Fortunius, a Donatist bishop, the question, almost at its outset, turned upon this point. The learned Father asked him which was the Church in which one must live well, "whether that which, according to the predictions of Holy Writ, was to be diffused over the entire world, or that which a small part of Africa, or of the Africans, contained? At first, he tried to assert that his communion was over the whole world. I asked him whether he could give letters of communion, which we call *formatæ*, whithersoever I wished; and I affirmed, what was clear to all, that by this test the entire question could be brought to a close."* But the Donatist soon ran off his ground, and turned to other matters. Now, if the courteous reader will take the trouble to turn over to the third volume of this Review (July, 1837),† he will find us challenging the Anglicans to the same proof of the assertion, which they make in common with the Donatist, that they are a part, or a branch, of the

* "Deinde quærere cœpimus, quænam illa esset Ecclesia ubi vivere sic oporteret, utrum illa quæ, sicut sancta ante Scriptura prædixerat, se terrarum orbe diffunderet, an illa quam pars exigua vel Afrorum, vel Africæ contineret. Hic primo asserere conatus est, ubique terrarum esse communionem suam. Quærebam utrum epistolas communicatorias quas formatas dicimus, posset quo vellem dare; et affirmabam quod manifestum erat omnibus, hoc modo facillime illam terminari posse quæstionem."—Epist. ad Eleus. Glor. et Fal. tom. ii. Ep. xliv. vol. clxiii. cap. 2.

† No. 2 of this volume, p. 31.

Church Catholic, dispersed over the world. We took Barrow's criterions of religious unity, and showed how no prelate of the Anglican Church could safely attempt to apply them in practice to his Church.* If he sent letters of communion to any foreign bishop (except, perhaps, in North America), they might be answered through courtesy, but the pledge of amity would not be accepted. We can challenge them, therefore, to the very same proof, as Augustine challenged Fortunius to; and the very fact of their not being able to submit to it would decide the question, as it did then, that they are in a state of schism. The twenty-third canon of the African code prescribes that if any bishop travel beyond the sea, he provide himself with *literæ formatæ*, or letters of communion from his primate. This proves that an active communion was required between churches separated by the sea, so that any bishop bearing such letters would be readily admitted into participation in all religious and ecclesiastical rites with the bishops of the country in which he might travel. Would such letters from the English primate be heeded even in Europe? How much less in China, in India, or Syria? Yet, not only the letter of a Catholic primate, but that wherewith every bishop or vicar-apostolic usually furnishes any of his clergy, who have occasion to

* Pp. 144, sqq. The criterions proposed by Dr. Barrow are all *acts* of communion, not one of which would in practice be applicable to the English Church.

go abroad, is received with respect by every foreign bishop, and secures to its bearer all the rights of communion in belief and practice, and opens to him at once the gates of the sanctuary, and the hearts of his fellow-laborers in Christ. St. Augustine is careful to remove the impression that when he wrote to any Donatist leaders, he thereby entered into communion of faith: and thus proves to us the difference between civility and charitable intercourse, and communion in religion: "Unde factum est," he writes, "ut etiam ad nonnullos Donatistarum primarios scriberemus, *non communicatorias literas, quas jam olim*, propter suam perversitatem, *ab unitate Catholica, quæ toto orbe diffusa est, non accipiunt*, sed tales privatas qualibus nobis uti etiam ad paganos licet."*

If the case, therefore, of the Anglican Church had to be decided by the principles and the voice of antiquity, we do not see how any verdict but that of schism could be pronounced against it. It is in a state of separation from the aggregate of churches dispersed over the world. It cannot make an excuse; it cannot raise a point either of fact or of right, in bar of judgment, which has not been already met by the judicious sagacity of the great

* "Whence it came that we wrote to some of the chief men among the Donatists, not letters of communion, which they do not receive for a long time from the Catholic unity dispersed over all the world, on account of their perversity, but such private letters as it is lawful for us to send even to pagans."—Ep. xliii. vol. clxii. cap. 1.

supporter of the unity of the Church, when combating the cavils of the Donatists. But we have yet a second and most important test provided for us by antiquity, whereby we must farther prove our point before we proceed to investigate the awful consequences in regard to apostolic succession and claims to authority that result from this state of separation.

II. The second criterion of the true church is closely allied to the first, though simpler in its application. According to the doctrine of the ancient Fathers, it is easy at once to ascertain who are the Church Catholic, and who are in a state of schism, by simply discovering who are in communion with the See of Rome, and who are not. This test, as we just remarked, is nearly connected with the foregoing: inasmuch, as the Chair of Peter being the centre of the Catholic unity, all that communicated with it knew at once that they were in communion with the rest of the Church dispersed over the world. To have kept up an active communication with all the sees, even with all the metropolitans of the world, would have been, for each bishop, a difficult, not to say, an impossible undertaking. Nor could the faithful have easily discovered whether their own bishop preserved Catholic unity in this way. Let us then at once show the various ways in which this connection with the Apostolic See was applied to the preservation of unity, and the immediate detection of schism.

1. We have seen that communion was actively kept up by means of the *epistolæ formatæ*. No doubt, on particular occasions, such as that mentioned by St. Augustine, any bishop writing to other sees would have received in reply letters of communion. But, ordinarily, this regular interchange of religious communion all centred in the Apostolic See. We will not here inquire whether the *formatæ* which *it* sent even to patriarchs were not of a much higher character, and contained a confirmation of their election, without which it was not admitted. We think decidedly that such was the case.* But as we have throughout this discussion desired and endeavored to deal generously with our opponents, and have not insisted upon any point which we could waive in our argument, we are willing to act consistently in this matter too; and shall therefore suppose that the *formatæ* of the Holy See went no further than to acknowledge religious communion with the bishops to whom they were addressed. Still this intercourse was considered essential to the maintenance of religious unity, and its absence was a clear indication of a state of schismatical separation. We

* Pope Boniface I. informs us that Theodosius, fearing lest the election of Nestorius to the Constantinopolitan patriarchate would be null,—"habere non existimans firmitatem," because he (the Pope) had not known of it, sent a deputation of courtiers and bishops, and "formatam huic a Sede Romana dirigi depoposcit, quæ ejus sacerdotium roboraret."—Ap. Coustant. Epp. Rom. Pont. col. 1043.

have a remarkable proof of this communication carried on by distant churches through the medium of the Holy See, in an argument employed by St. Augustine. The Donatists, to prove that the rest of the Church had kept communion with them, asserted that the Council of Sardica had written a letter to Donatus of Carthage. To this the holy Father replies that, supposing the synod to have been orthodox, it does not follow that the Donatus mentioned was the bishop of Carthage, as the names of the sees are not cited in the letter. He then adds, "quod hinc maxime credibile est, quod ad Carthaginis episcopum, Romano prætermisso, nunquam orientalis Catholica scriberet."* But St. Optatus is the writer who uses this argument in the clearest manner, and proves the schism of the Donatists by the simple fact of their not communicating with the rest of the world through him who sat in the Chair of Peter. After tracing the succession of pastors from St. Peter to Siricius, he adds, "who is in fellowship with us, with whom the entire world is joined, in the society of one communion through the intercourse of *formatæ*."†

2. But this was by no means the highest ground on which communion with the See of Rome was

* "Which is the more credible, because the oriental Catholic Church never wrote to the bishop of Carthage, passing over the bishop of Rome."—Cont. Crescon lib. iii. cap. 34.

† See the text quoted below.

required of all who wished to be considered within the pale of the Catholic Church. It was not for the convenience of mutual intercourse, but for the necessity of ecclesiastical unity, that the Chair of Peter and his successors had been made the centre, and received the headship of the Church. St. Ambrose, writing to the emperors, calls the Holy City, "totius orbis Romani caput Romanam Ecclesiam . . . . . inde enim in omnes venerandæ communionis jura dimanant."* St. Optatus, however, lays the greatest stress upon this point. Again and again he presses the charge of schism upon the Donatists, because they are separated from the Chair of Peter. Having proved that the Catholic, or true Church, must be diffused over the entire world, he proceeds to point out more particular marks and ornaments whereby it may be more easily distinguished. The first of these is the *Cathedra* or episcopal chair. By this it is evident that he did not mean episcopacy in general, nor the succession of bishops validly ordained, as he allows the Donatists to have possessed these. He goes on therefore to explain his meaning, and apply it. "We must see," he writes, "who sat first upon the chair, and where. If you are ignorant, learn: if you know it, blush; you cannot be charged with ignorance, therefore you must know it . . . . Therefore you cannot deny

* "The Roman Church head of the entire Roman empire . . . . for thence flow to all the rights of venerable communion."—Ep. ii. ad. Grat. et. Valent.

that you know, that in the city of Rome, the episcopal chair was bestowed on Peter first, on which sat Peter, the head of all the apostles, whence he was called Cephas; in which ONE CHAIR unity was to be preserved by all, lest the rest of the apostles should stand up each one for a separate Church; SO THAT HE SHOULD BE A SCHISMATIC AND A SINNER WHO SHOULD SET UP AGAINST THE ONE CHAIR, another."* Before proceeding to the next words of the Father, we will indulge in one or two remarks. It is repugnant to the obvious purport of his argument to imagine, with Chillingworth or Mr. Poole, that he here speaks only of schism *within* the Roman Church, strictly so called, by the setting up of a Donatist bishop in the city of Rome, in opposition to the one in direct succession from St. Peter. For St. Optatus speaks of the Roman See as *one* and *singular*, in reference not to any rival pretensions that might be set up

* "Videndum est quis, et ubi prior cathedram sederit. Si ignoras, disce; si nosti, erubesce; ignorantia tibi adscribi non potest, restat ergo ut noveris . . . . Igitur negare non potes scire te in urbe Roma, Petro primo cathedram episcopalem esse collatam, in qua sederit omnium apostolorum caput Petrus, unde et Cephas appellatus est, in qua una cathedra unitas ab omnibus servaretur; ne ceteri apostoli singulas sibi quisque defenderent: ut jam schismaticus et peccator esset, qui contra singularem cathedram, alteram collocaret."—De Schism. Donat. lib. ii. cap. ii. p. 31. The learned author to whom we allude in the next page, reads *tibi* for *sibi* in the last sentence.—St. Cyprian Vindicated, p. 20. We follow Dupin's edition, which gives no various reading here. Of course the sense is precisely the same.

with it, but in reference to the sees erected by the other apostles. Unity was to be preserved in this chair, in such way, as that no other *apostolic* chair was to be set up against it, without incurring the guilt of schism. What could be the motive for introducing here the mention of other apostolic sees, if the object was only to lay the basis for an argument that he was a schismatic who erected a rival throne in the same see? A proposition so evident, that it certainly required no appeal to the respective positions of Peter and the other apostles. But St. Optatus well knew that there was a twofold form of schism, one by separation from the immediate bishop, who forms the first link with each one in the chain of unity, and the other, consequent on it, by separation from the centre at which the various chains are joined together. For otherwise, what can be the meaning of his thus addressing Parmenianus: "Nec Cæcilianus recessit a *Cathedra Petri vel Cypriani*, sed Majorinus cujus tu cathedram sedes?"* What, we ask, is the meaning of these words, unless a schism in Africa, at Carthage, was considered a separation not only from the see of that city, on which Cyprian had sat, but also from that of Rome? We therefore conclude, that St. Optatus in declaring every one a sinful schismatic who sits up a rival chair to that of Peter, spoke not of those in Rome

* "Nor did Cæcilianus separate himself from the chair of Peter, or of Cyprian; but Majorinus did, whose see you occupy."—Lib. i. cap. x. p. 10.

itself, but of any, who, in distant countries, established the independence of their sees.

The learned Father, having thus laid the foundation of his argument, proceeds to apply it to the Donatist controversy in the following terms: "Therefore, the one chair, which is the first of the properties [of the Church,] Peter filled the first, to whom succeeded Linus; to Linus succeeded Clement" . . . . [here the saint enumerates all the Pontiffs down to his time; then concludes,] "to Damasus, Siricius, who is now in fellowship with us, with whom the entire world, is joined with us, in the society of one communion, through the intercourse of *formatæ*. You give an account of the orgin of your chair, you who wish to claim to be the holy Church."* It may be deemed necessary for us to reply to the cavils of the two above-named divines, upon this, as we have done on the preceding part of St. Optatus's text. We are, indeed, dispensed from the task, by the able manner in which we find it has just been done by the Rev. F. C. Husenbeth, who, by his answer to Mr. Poole, has added another to the many claims he already possessed, to the respect and gratitude of British Catholics, and has gained a new title to

* "Ergo cathedram unicam, quæ est prima de dotibus sedit prior Petrus, cui successit Linus, Lino successit Clemens . . . . . Damaso Siricius, hodie qui noster est socius, cum quo nobiscum totus orbis, commercio formatarum in una communionis societate concordat. Vestræ Cathedræ vos originem reddite qui vobis vultis sanctam Ecclesiam vindicare."—Lib. ii. cap. iv. p. 32.

the character he so justly bears of a sound divine, a ready polemic, and a zealous ecclesiastic.* We will content ourselves, therefore, with a very few remarks. In laying down the point which he intended to prove, that is, which church had the marks or properties of the Catholic, St. Optatus never once intimates that he had removed the question from Africa to Rome. For it is evident that he wrote his work for the conviction of the African Donatists, and naturally selected arguments applicable to them. So his marks of the Church are such as would apply in any country. Now, after he has given the argument we have just seen from the Chair of Peter, he introduces, simply as an objection to the argument, the Donatists' assertion that they too had a church and a chair at Rome. "But you also say," he writes, "that you have some part in the city of Rome."† Surely this is not the way in which the main argument is likely to be introduced. It is evidently nothing more than an objection, which the writer thinks might be thrown in by the adversary, and which he deems it right to remove, before proceeding with the argument. Accordingly, the Father shows how little right the Donatists have to consider their African bishop resides in Rome,

* "St. Cyprian Vindicated, against certain misrepresentations of his doctrine in a work by the Rev. G. A. Poole." Norwich, 1839, p. 64.

† "Sed et habere vos in urbe Romæ partem aliquam dicitis."—Cap. iv.

as the true representative of the Apostolic See; and then concluding that Peter, the "Prince of the Catholics" (Nostrum Principem), had alone the keys given him, he proceeds with the argument on general grounds, by no means applicable to Rome alone. Yet, throughout he continues to argue against the Donatist schism in general, as separated from the chair of Peter, and thereby at once condemned: "Unde est ergo quod claves regni cœlorum vobis usurpare contenditis, qui contra cathedram Petri . . . . . sacrilegio militatis?"* Nay, he even goes farther than this. He had proposed five marks of the true Church, whereby it could be distinguished from all schismatical congregations. The first is the one we have seen,—the chair, and he concludes that this is proved to be exclusively his side's through the chair of Peter. "Igitur de dotibus supradictis cathedra est, ut diximus, prima, quam probavimus per Petrum nostram esse."† This surely could not be said, if, as Mr. Poole supposes,‡ the argument was only of use against Macrobius and his miserable handful of lurking sectarians in Rome. Then, what is still more important, St. Optatus hardly

*"How is it that you should attempt to usurp the keys of the kingdom of heaven, who are engaged in sacrilegious war against the chair of Peter?"—Cap. v.

†"Therefore of the above-rehearsed properties, the chair is the first, which we have proved to be ours through Peter."—Cap. vi.

‡Ap. Husenbeth, *ubi sup.*

touches upon several of these marks, but contents himself with asserting that he has proved his church to possess them, through the chair of Peter: "Et per cathedram Petri quæ nostra est, per ipsam et ceteras dotes apud nos esse."* By proving, therefore, this one point, he considers the argument as satisfactory as if he had fully demonstrated each of the other marks to belong exclusively to his church. Further, we will observe, that these characteristics of the true Church were not originally proposed by St. Optatus, but by his Donatist adversary.† Now it is not probable that he should by "cathedra" have meant the local See of Rome, which they could not, without consummate impudence, pretend to claim; particularly, as we shall see that it was part of their tactics to keep the question on African ground, and decline all reference to the state of foreign churches. In fine, we find St. Augustine employ the same argument from the succession in the Roman See, where certainly there can be no room for Chillingworth's exceptions. For this Father composed a rude poem, or psalm, which might be sung by the common people of Africa (for he always speaks of other churches under title of transmarine), and in this he gives, as the principal evidence against

* "And by the chair of Peter which is ours, by it the other properties are with us."—Cap. ix. p. 38.

† "Videndum ubi sunt quinque dotes quas tu sex esse dixisti."—Lib. ii. cap. ii. St. Optatus afterwards tells us which he excluded to reduce them to five, which, consequently, he admitted.—Cap. viii.

the Donatist, the succession of bishops in the chair of Peter. These are his words:—

"Venite fratres, si vultis ut inseramini in vite,
Dolor est cum vos videmus præcisos ita jacere.
Numerate sacerdotes vel ab ipsa Petri sede,
Et in ordine illo Patrum quis cui successit videte.
Ipsa est petra, quam non vincunt superbæ inferorum portæ."*

3. It will not, therefore, be surprising to see how, in practice, this simple rule was adopted, for at once ascertaining who were the Catholics, and who the schismatics. St. Ambrose informs us that his brother Satyrus, not yet partaker of the sacred mysteries, being in imminent danger of shipwreck, tied the blessed Eucharist round his neck in an *orarium*, or scarf, and fearlessly committed himself to the waves. Arrived on shore, and having experienced the efficacy of this great sacrament, when thus externally applied, he concluded how much more excellent its virtue must be when actually received into the breast, and therefore ardently desired to be partaker of it. But the schism of Lucifer prevailed in that country; and, therefore, he resolved to be cautious

* "Come, brethren, if you wish to be engrafted in the vine,
It grieves us to see you thus lie cut off.
Number the priests in the very chair of Peter,
And see in that order of fathers who succeeded the other.
This is the rock which the proud gates of hell overcome not."
Contra partem Donati Psalmus, *versus fin.*

how he communicated with the clergy. "He sent for the bishop, nor did he think there was any true grace save that of true faith. He asked of him whether he agreed with the Catholic bishops, and that is with the Roman Church."* Such was the simple test, which one, not yet initiated in the mysteries of Christianity, had learnt; he did not inquire into the succession of that particular church or see, nor whether it taught all that is declared in the creeds, nor whether it was "an independent branch of the Church Catholic;" but simply whether the bishop who came to him kept, or not, communion with the Roman Church. Had Satyrus thus been cast in our days upon the shores of England or Ireland, he certainly would have rejected the ministry of the Establishment-bishops, who claim their rights upon the pretended grounds just rehearsed, and would have admitted the bishop, or vicar, or priest, who could alone have answered affirmatively to his one simple question. Another instance of the application of this easy test, we have in the life of St. Fulgentius, written by his disciple. As he was proceeding to the deserts of Thebais, to study virtue from its celebrated anchorites, the Bishop Eulalius thus addressed him: "You do right thus to aim at perfection; but you know that without faith it is impossible to

* "Advocavit ad se episcopum, nec ullam veram putavat, nisi veræ fidei gratiam: percontatusque ex eo est, utrumnam cum episcopis Catholicis, hoc est cum Romana Ecclesia conveniret."—De Obitu Satyri Fratris.

please God. The countries which you desire to visit, a perfidious dispensation hath separated from the communion of the B. Peter; all those monks, whose wonderful abstinence is celebrated, have not the sacrament of the altar in communion with you . . . . . Return, my son, lest, for the sake of perfection of life, you incur danger of right faith." * Thus we see how, even in Egypt, communion with the See of Rome was at once a sufficient test of orthodoxy, and of participation in the communion of the Catholic Church. It is hardly necessary for us to cite the well-known words of St. Jerome, who, by the same process, resolves the complications of a manifold schism, and decides who is right. "Hinc in tres partes divisa Ecclesia ad se rapere me festinat . . . . . Ego interim clamito: Si quis Cathedræ Petri jungitur meus est; Meletius, Vitalis, et Paulinus tibi [the pope] hærere se dicunt; possem credere si hoc unus assereret: nunc autem duo mentiuntur aut omnes." † Nay, so well understood was this rule,

* "Recta facis cupiens meliora sectari; see scis quoniam Deo sine fide impossibile est placere. Terras ad quas pergere concupiscis a communione B. Petri perfida dissentio separavit; omnes illi monachi quorum prædicatur admirabilis abstinentia, non habent tecum altaris sacramenta communia . . . . . Revertere, fili, ne vitæ melioris intuitu periculum rectæ fidei patiaris."—Apud Bolland. 1. Jan. cap. 12.

† "Hence the Church, divided into three parts, strives to drag me, each to itself . . . . In the mean time, I cry out, If any one is joined to the chair of Peter, he is mine. Meletius, Vitalis, and Paulinus say that they cleave to you. I might believe it, if one said it; but now two of them, or all three, speak untruly."—Epist. tom. iv. p. 14. ed. Maur

that Eusebius gives an instance of its application by a heathen emperor. For, when Paul of Samosata had refused to obey the decree of deposition pronounced against him by the Council of Antioch, or yield his see to Domnus, the case being referred to Aurelian, he decided that he should be held the true bishop who had letters (of communion) from the bishop of Rome.*

4. This principle, however, was not merely adopted for convenience of application, as affording a rule, which rude and unenlightened minds could supply, but it was followed by the highest dignitaries of the Church on the most solemn occasions. The Council of Constantinople, under the patriarch Mennas, lays down this rule: "We follow and obey the Apostolic See; and those who are in communion with it, we hold in communion; those whom it condemns, we likewise condemn." † We have another remarkable declaration of John, patriarch of Constantinople, who, writing to Pope Hormisdas, protests that he follows in all things the Apostolic See, and preaches all that it has decreed, and therefore hopes to be in one communion with that see, "in which is the entire and perfect solidity of the Christian religion." Should any one assert that

* Ap. Euseb. H. E. lib. vii. cap. 30.

† Ἡμεῖς γὰρ . . . τῷ ἀποστολικῷ θρόνῳ ἑξακολουθοῦμέν τε, καὶ πειθόμεθα, καί τοὺς κοινωνικοὺς αὐτοῦ κοινωνικοὺς ἔχομεν, καὶ τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κατακριθέντας καὶ ἡμεῖς κατακρίνομεν.—Labbe, Conc. tom. v. col. 92.

this is said only under the circumstance of the pope's being at that time acknowledged orthodox by the rest of the Church, and does not contain the maintenance of a principle applicable to all possible cases, we beg him to attend to the words which immediately follow: "Promising for the future, that whoever are separated from the communion of the Catholic Church, THAT IS, WHO CONSENT NOT IN ALL THINGS WITH THE APOSTOLIC SEE, their names shall not be recited in the sacred mysteries," * the ordinary mark of communion. This at once excludes all idea of the possibility of the See of Rome, or those in unity with it, being considered heretics or schismatics, as the *Tracts for the Times*, professing to deliver the doctrines of antiquity, would pretend is now the case. As we are treating of this great pope, we cannot help turning the reader's attention to another letter, from the bishop of Nicopolis, to him, in which he holds even stronger language. But as it refers more to the jurisdiction of the pontiffs over the entire world, and to their infallible authority in teaching, than to the necessity of union with them, we will only refer to it in general terms. † St. Gregory the Great has preserved the formu-

* "In qua est integra Christianæ religionis et perfecta soliditas. . . . Promittentes in sequenti tempore, sequestratos a communione Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, id est, in omnibus non consentientes Sedi Apostolicæ, eorum nomina inter sacra non esse recitanda mysteria."—Ibid. tom. iv. col. 1487.

† Ibid. col. 1438.

lary signed by bishops reclaimed from schism. "I, bishop of . . . . willingly and spontaneously have, by the divine grace, returned to the unity of the Apostolic See; and . . . . I pledge myself, under pain of forfeiture of my order, and under the penalty of anathema I promise to thee, and through thee to St. Peter, the prince of the apostles, and to his vicar, the blessed Gregory, or his successors, never to return to the schism . . . . but always to remain in the unity of the holy Catholic Church, and the communion of the Roman pontiff." *

We have thus seen the two grounds on which the ancient Church mainly supported an accusation of schism; the two rules which it gave to the faithful for deciding when they were to continue in communion with a body of Christians, however great, and however national, who claimed their obedience, or their communion. They had not to perplex themselves with doctrinal points, or controversial subtleties—they had simply to ascertain,

* "Ego episcopus . . . . prona et spontanea voluntate ad unitatem Sedis Apostolicæ, divina gratia duce, reversus sum . . . . Et sub mei ordinis casu spondeo, et anathematis obligatione, atque promitto tibi, et per te S. Petro apostolorum principi, atque ejus vicario beatissimo Gregorio, vel successoribus ipsius . . . . ad schisma . . . . nunquam reversurum, sed semper me in unitate S. Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, et communione Romani pontificis permansurum."—S. Gregorii M. Opera, tom. ii. p. 1300, ed. Maur. [This form of reconciliation to the Church is yet to be found in the Roman Pontifical, to be used when a bishop receives a convert into communion with the Church.]

first, whether or no these persons were held in communion by the rest of the Church, that is by the aggregate of churches dispersed over the world; and, *secondly*, whether they adhere to the Apostolic Roman See. Wherever they found these two conditions verified, there they were to join themselves: wherever they existed not, there was schism, and they were to have no part with those that formed it.* Now let us apply these two tests to the Anglican Church. In our first article above referred to, we proved, that it can show no communion with the rest of the Christian episcopal world, even taking those criterions of that communion which its own approved divines have laid down. And as to the second condition, that of communion with the Roman See, we think there can be no hesitation what to decide, inasmuch as, by a formal act, the English Church, in 1534, disavowed all dependence upon it, and from that moment ceased to communicate with it. Certain it is, that *de facto* that church has, since that time (excepting the reign of Mary), held no unity or communication with either Rome or the rest of the Catholic world. And this has nothing to do with the question of doctrine, or any inquiry as to

* There is an interesting passage in St. Augustine, too long to quote (Cont. Lit. Petil. lib. ii. cap. 125), in which he unites the two criterions of the Roman and the universal Church's communion, observing that the Church founded upon a rock, is not by reason of this foundation confined to one place, but it is spread all over the world.

whether the body of the Catholic Church deviated from true faith at Trent, and rendered it imperative then to separate from it; an idea, however, incompatible with what we have already seen above, and much that we could add. For, the separation from unity took place before this, and had no reference to doctrine, further than the exclusion of the supremacy on Scriptural grounds.* The Anglican Church, therefore, spontaneously constituted itself in a state of schism.

At the outset of this article, we assumed, as a point on which our principal adversaries would agree with us, that a church, or portion of a church, thus constituted in schism, however valid its ordination, could have no part in the apostolical succession. For the satisfaction, however, of such readers as may not be so well versed in ecclesiastical antiquities, we will now say a few words on the subject.

1. Schism is pronounced by the Fathers a dreadful sin, whether in a Church or in individuals, who knowingly persevere in it. St. Augustine thus writes of it: "Quod autem vos a tortius orbis communions separatos videmus (quod sceluset maximum, et manifestum, et omnium vestrum est), si exaggerare velim, tempus me sitius quam verba deficient."† On another occasion, he calls it "sac-

* "No event in the history of England is marked by circumstances so peculiar as those which attended *the separation of the national Church from the Romish communion.*"—British Critic, No. xliv. Oct. 1837, p. 300.

† "That you should be found separated from the com-

rilegium schismatis, quod omnia scelera supergraditur."* St. Fulgentius, in the strongest terms, excludes all schismatics from eternal salvation.†

2 Farther, they do not admit a possible case that can justify such separation; as they consider the evil done to the Church by schism sufficient to counterbalance any imaginary good to be gained, and equal to any real or imaginary evil to be thereby avoided. St. Irenæus says, that such persons swallow a camel while they strain at a gnat, "for no correction can be made by them equal to the bane of schism."‡ St. Augustine, speaking of converts made by the Donatists from heathenism, employs this severe language: "Itaque illos quos sanant a vulnere idolatriæ, gravius feriunt vulnere schismatis."§ We refrain from farther quotations, which we could multiply to any extent.

3. Though the valid exercise of the sacramen-

munion of the entire world (which is a wickedness most grievous, manifest, and chargeable on you all), if I wished to show its aggravation, time would fail me before words."—Cont. Lit, Petil. lib. ii. cap. 8.

* "The sacrilege of schism, which transcends all crimes."—Cont. Epist. Parmen. lib. i. cap. 4.

† "Firmissime tene et nullatenus dubites hæreticos atque schismaticos, qui extra Ecclesiam Catholicam præsentem finiunt vitam, in ignem æternum ituros."—De Fide, ad Pet. Biblioth. Vet. Par. tom. ix. p. 82, ed. Paris.

‡ "Nulla enim ab eis potest fieri tanta correctio, quanta est schismatis pernicies."—Lib. iv. cap. 33.

§ "Therefore those whom they cure of the wound of idolatry, they more grievously strike with the wound of schism."—De Baptismo, cont. Donat. lib. i. cap. 8.

tal power was allowed to such schismatics as preserved the lawful forms, yet its legitimate exercise was never acknowledged. St. Augustine makes the distinction respecting baptism: "Item alia duo dicimus esse apud Donatistas, baptismum, non autem illic recte accipi."* And, on other occasion, he says, of the same sacrament, that, in his opinion, when given under certain circumstances (not then cleared up by a general council), the sacrament would be valid, but "not profitable to life eternal, so long as they remained separated from the Catholic Church."† Now, the same Father repeatedly compares the sacrament of orders with that of baptism, illustrating the latter from the former: so that the same distinction between validity and lawfulness of exercise must be admitted. For instance, "Nam sicut redeuntes, qui priusquam recederent baptizati sunt; non rebaptizantur; ita redeuntes, qui priusquam recederent ordinati sunt, non utique rursus ordinantur, sed aut administrant quod administrabant, si hoc ecclesiæ utilitas postulat, aut si non administrant, SACRAMENTUM ordinationis tamen gerunt . . . . Nam neque SACRAMENTUM baptismi, nec SACRAMENTUM

* "Likewise two other things we say are among the Donatists; baptism, but that it is not there rightly received."—Ibid. cap. 3. He had just said that in the Catholic Church, "et esse baptismum, et illic tantum recte accipi."

† "Quanquam eis ad vitam æternam non prodesset, si 'haritate caruissent qua Catholicæ insererentur Ecclesiœ.''—Ib. lib. vii. cap. 53.

DANDI BAPTISMI . . . . . Felicianus amisit." * Ordination, here pronounced a sacrament (contrary to the doctrine of the Anglican Church), is put on the same footing with baptism, in reference to the effects exercised on it by schism, and therefore, however validly, cannot be lawfully or profitably conferred, in a church separated from the unity of faith and religious communion. There is another passage, still more beautiful, that illustrates the doctrine of baptism by that of order and other sacraments, which we cannot forbear quoting, on account of its likewise contradicting the Anglican, and confirming the Catholic, doctrine of the sacraments. It is the following; "Si ergo ad hoc valet quod dictum est in Evangelio, 'Deus peccatorem non audit,' ut per peccatorem *sacramenta* non celebrentur; quomodo exaudit homicidam deprecantem vel super aquam baptismi, vel super oleum, vel super Eucharistiam, vel super capita eorum quibus manus imponitur? Quæ omnia tamen et fiunt et valent etiam per homicidas . . etiam in ipsa intus Ecclesia. 'Cum nemo dare possit quod non habet,' *quomodo dat homicida Spiritum Sanctum?*" † The distinc-

* "For, as those that return, who, before they separated, had been baptized, are not rebaptized, so they that return, who before they separated had been ordained, are not again ordained, but either resume the ministry they had before, if the service of the Church require it, or if they minister not, yet bear *the sacrament* of orders. For neither the sacrament of baptism, nor *the sacrament of giving baptism*, did Felicianus . . . . lose."—Ibid. lib. vii. cap. 2.

† "If, therefore, what is said in the Gospel, that 'God

tion, therefore, holds good between the valid and the lawful exercise and bestowing of orders; so that the former may exist in a schismatical church; the latter *never can.*

4. Hence, St. Augustine has no hesitation in addressing the following strong language to the Donatist bishops: "If you ask me by what fruits we know you to be rather ravenous wolves, I object to you the crime of schism; which you will deny; but I will instantly prove; for you do not communicate with other nations, and with the churches founded by the labor of the apostles." *

5. In fine, upon the return of any Donatist

hears not sinners,' have this force, that *a sacrament* cannot be conferred by a sinner, how does he hear a murderer [one devoid of charity, as the Father explains it] praying either over the water of baptism, or over the oil [confirmation] or over the Eucharist, or over the heads of those on whom he lays hands [orders]? All which, however, are done, and are validly done even by murderers . . . even within the Church itself. Since no one can give that which he has not, *how can a murderer give the Holy Ghost?*"—Ibid. lib. v. cap. 20. From which we draw two conclusions opposed to the doctrines of the Tracts; first, that order, as well as confirmation, is a true sacrament, that gives the Holy Ghost; secondly, that it has a form of words, and does not differ from the true sacrament, by consisting only in the imposition of hands.—Cf. Tract No. i. p. 3; v. 10; and Dr. Pusey's Lett. Tr. vol. iii. p. 11.

* "Si autem a me quæras quibus fructibus vos potius esse lupos rapaces cognoscamus, objicio schismatis crimen, quod tu negabis, ego autem statim probabo; neque enim communicas omnibus gentibus, et illis ecclesiis apostolico labore fundatis."—Cont. Litteras. Petil. lib. ii. cap. 16.

bishop to the unity of faith, the Church sufficiently showed how far it was from admitting any right in him to a place in the apostolical succession. The third council of Carthage, in 397, decreed as follows: First, that what had been decreed in preceding councils be confirmed, "ne quis Donatistarum cum honore suo recipiatur sed in numero laicorum;" secondly, that an exception be made in favor of those who had never rebaptized, or who came over to the Catholic communion with their flocks. Thirdly, it was deemed advisable that this decree should not be finally confirmed till the judgment of the transmarine or Italian Church had been obtained.* This was similar treatment to that of the Meletians and Novatians, mentioned in our former article. †

The voice of antiquity is, therefore, clear and loud upon the claims to apostolical succession of any church involved in schism, that is, which is not in communion with other churches, and especially with that of Rome. Implicated in a crime which no possible circumstances can justify; exer-

* Labbe, tom. iii. col. 1181. St. Augustine thus speaks of this matter, acknowledging the validity of Donatists' orders, —not because hands are imposed, which the theory of the *Tracts* requires, but because a proper *form* of words was used. "Et de episcopis quidem vel clericis recipiendis, alia quæstio est. Quamvis enim, cum apud vos ordinantur, non super eos invocetur nomen Donati sed Dei, tamen ita suscipiuntur ut videtur paci et utilitati Ecclesiæ convenire."—Cont. Cresconium Grammat. lib. i. cap. 11.

† No. 5 of this series, p. 168.

cising their functions, even when validly, still without profit to the souls of men; styled wolves rather than shepherds; admitted into the Church only as laymen,—can bishops so characterized have been considered by the ancient Church descendants and representatives of the apostles?

Our argument ought naturally to close here; but the lessons furnished us by the Donatist schism are not ended. We will, therefore, beg our readers' farther indulgence, for several remarkable points of resemblance, not yet noted, between the former schism, and that which unfortunately separates our country from the universal Church.

1. It is singular that, in process of time, there sprung up among the Donatists a High Church party, the most distinguished of whom seems to have been Ticonius. He saw the absurdity of excluding the numerous churches dispersed all over the world, from the pale of Christ's true Church, one of whose principal attributes he perceived was universality. This Ticonius demonstrated with great learning and acuteness; but remained blind to the natural consequences to be drawn from his views, namely, that his own church was schismatical, and that it was his individual duty to abandon it, and become a Catholic. His fellow-churchmen, however, saw this—the Fausetts and Shuttleworths of their day—they were aware that his principles, pushed to their legitimate consequences, would necessarily lead to the abandoning of

Africanism, and the embracing of Catholicity. Parmenianus was the champion who undertook to chastise the audacity of this reformer; and not content with writing a letter or pamphlet against him, he had him condemned by a council of his church. Parmenianus seriously warns him of the danger of maintaining, as he did, that foreign churches, in communion with Rome, formed part of the true Church of Christ. The Catholics, however, were not slow to step in between the disputants; and giving due commendation to the learning and good intentions of Ticonius, took proper advantage of the truth he had discovered. St. Augustine placed the shield of his vast genius over him, and defended him against Parmenianus.*

2. The High Church divines in England maintain that the Irish and English Catholics are schismatics, because they "separate themselves from the Anglican Church, and make congregations contrary to their canonical bishops."† The answer to this assertion resolves itself into the inquiry, whether one is bound to prefer the communion of the universal Church out of one's own country, to that of bishops in it (all questions of doctrine being left aside), who are not in that communion. This was a case particularly applicable to England at the time of the Reformation, more than it is now. Well, St. Augustine seems

* Cont. Epist. Parmen. lib. i. cap. 1.

† British Critic, No. xl. p. 435; Dub. Rev. vol. iii, p. 73.

to have had no doubt on the subject. He observes that Ticonius did not perceive the true consequence of his own principles:—but we must give the holy Father's own words: "Non vidit quod consequenter videndum fuit, illos videlicet in Africa Christianos pertinere ad Ecclesiam toto orbe diffusam, qui utique non istis ab ejusdem orbis communione atque unitate sejunctis, sed ipsi orbi terrarum per communionem connecterentur. Parmenianus autem cæterique Donatistæ viderunt hoc esse consequens."* It is therefore our duty to preserve communion with the general Catholic Church, rather than with the particular church of our country, when that has separated itself from that communion.

3. The writers in the Tracts for the Times, seeing how the argument which they make against English Catholics can be well retorted against French Protestants, are anxious not to introduce, into the controversy at home, the question of foreign Catholics and separatists from them.† We observe a similar solicitude in the Donatists of old. Emeritus, one of their bishops, thus ex-

* "He did not see what, as a consequence he should have seen, that those Christians in Africa belonged to the Church spread over the whole world, who, indeed, were not connected with those, who were separated from the communion and unity of that world, but were united by communion with the world itself. Parmenianus and the other Donatists saw this consequence."—Ibid.

† Tract iv. p. 6. "Neither do we desire to pass any sentence upon persons of other countries."

presses this feeling at the conference of Carthage —"Intelligit præstantia tua nihil nobisde peregrinis, nihil nobis de longe positis præjudicare posse, cum inter Afros hoc negotium ventiletur."*

4. The same Tracts consider the Catholic bishops as intruders, because sent where there were already bishops in quiet and legitimate possession.† The same complaint was made by the Donatists, that the Catholics sent bishops into dioceses in their possession; which proves, that the Catholics then believed themselves to have the same rights as they have later exercised. Petilianus complains, that in the diocese of Milevis, they had erected three new bishoprics, and that, in his own, Delphinus had been appointed in opposition.‡ At the same time, the Catholics severely reproved the Donatists for appointing one of their bishops to a see where there was already one in communion with the rest of the Church beyond the seas.§ This will apply to the Irish Protestant hierarchy, as the former principle will to the English. In the canonical code of the African Church, we have a decree of a provincial council that, dating from a certain period, the Catholic bishops had to claim jurisdiction over the

* "Your excellency understands, that nothing from strangers, nothing from persons living far off, can prejudice us, since this cause is between Africans."—Gesta Collat. Dies 3 No. 99, ad calc. Op. S. Opt.

† Tract 35.

‡ Gesta Collat. Dies 1; ubi sup. p. 258.

§ St. Aug. contra Epist. Parmen. lib. i. cap. 3.

dioceses held by the Donatists, whether converted to unity, or not.* This shows, in how little esteem was held a bishop's authority, who communicated not with the rest of the Church.

5. We have been struck how the Donatists, while they did not relish this name, had no objection to the national appellation of *Africans*,—the *African Church*, which is consequently often applied to their party by the Fathers, without any offensive meaning: at the same time that the latter gloried in bearing no other appellation but that of *Catholic*. In like manner, the denomination Anglican, is assumed by our High Churchmen, and we willingly accord it; at the same time, we repudiate every designation, save that of *Catholic*.

6. In fine, as from the great Donatist Church we have seen how many dissenting sects sprung up, and have therein traced no small resemblance to the fate of the Anglican, so have we a counterpart to our conduct towards this, in the conduct of the Fathers towards the former. For, the great body of the Donatists immediately treated those separatists as schismatics, and severely denounced against them the penalties of schism, precisely as the Tract writers deal with dissenters from the Anglican Church.† St. Augustine thus retorts upon the Donatists what they said of their

* See Tracts ii. p. 3; iv. p. 5; and xxix.

† Integer Codex Canonum Eccl. Afric. ap. Labbe, tom. iii col. 1116.

separatists: "Cui enim unquam schismatico suo pepercerunt, qui sibi ab orbe terrarum, cujus ipsi schismatici sunt, nimis impudenter parci volunt? cum a vera sola ipsa unitate justissime schismata puniantur, si eo modo ista punienda sunt." * This is a severe retort, but not more severe than we have a right to make in our days. The Council of Carthage, seeing the advantage which this argument gave the Catholics, decreed, that envoys should be sent among the Donatists, expressly to inculcate it; since, "by it is demonstrated, if they will but attend to it, that it was as wicked for them to be then cut off from the unity of the Church, as they now cry out that it was wicked in the Maximinianists to make a schism from them." † For Maximinianists, read Wesleyans, or Quakers, and you have an exact answer to the complaints in the Tracts. On another occasion, writing to some Donatists, he bids them contrast

* "For what schismatic from themselves did they ever spare,—they who too impudently wish to be spared by the entire world, from which they are schismatics? whereas, only by the true unity, schisms are most justly punished; if, indeed, they are to be punished in that manner,"—that is, by appeal to the civil power, which this Father strongly blames in them. This constant eagerness for the exclusive support of the civil magistrate, might have formed another point of contrast between the African and Anglican churches.—Ubi sup. lib. ii. cap. 13.

† "Ubi eis demonstratur, si attendere velint, tam inique tunc illos ab Ecclesiæ unitate præcisos, quam inique nunc clamant a se Maximinianistas schisma fecisse."—Conc. Carthag. Africæ Univ. ad calc. S. Opt. p. 211.

the great body of bishops from which they separated, with the small number from which *their* schismatics departed. "Multum quidem interest et incomparabiliter distat vel auctoritate vel numero Africana Ecclesia [observe the name] si cum ceteris orbis partibus conferatur; et longè minor est, *etiamsi unitas hic esset*, longe omnino minor est comparata ceteris Christianis omnibus gentibus, quam pars Maximiani comparata parti Primiani."* Here is an argument well fashioned to our hand to be wielded at pleasure against the arrogant pretensions of the Anglican High Churchmen; when they, on the one hand, charge others with the mote of schism from a national church, seeing not the beam of schism from the universal Church, which fearfully presses on their own cause. Truly, if we would but fill our quiver from the armory of the Fathers, we should find no difficulty in piercing any mail of proof in which our adversaries may think proper to encase themselves. There is not an argument, a cavil, which they can use, that will not be found answered by anticipation in the writings of the venerable lights of the ancient Church. Hence, we augur results most favorable to the cause of truth from

* "There is much difference and an incomparable distance in number or authority between the African Church and the remaining parts of the world: and it is far smaller—*supposing unity to exist in it*—it is, indeed, far smaller, compared with all other Christian nations, than the party of Maximianus is, compared to that of Primianus."—Epist. xliii. ol. clxii. cap. 9.

the publication of the Fathers in a form accessible to ordinary readers.

There is one view of the apostolical succession, taken by the authors of the Tracts, which we most cordially admit, because conformable to the doctrine of antiquity. It is that explained in the fifty-fourth Tract, p. 4, in these words: "How had the right interpretation of Scripture been preserved in each of those places? [Rome, Corinth, &c.] By the succession of bishops, each in turn, handing over to the bishop that followed him, what he had himself learned of his predecessors." Thus, it appears that the apostolical succession, where it exists, is a guarantee to the faithful, that the same doctrine is taught which has been taught from the beginning. Now, if we apply this test to the Anglican Church, how certainly it must fail! For it is as clear as noonday, that the bishops, after the so-called Reformation, taught the doctrine *opposite* to that of their immediate predecessors. Cranmer, for instance, blasphemed transubstantiation under Edward, which had been taught in his see till his time. Where, then, is that evidence of such succession, which perseverance in the same doctrine ought to afford!,

END OF VOL. III.

208.9
W 755
8947
WISEMAN, CARDINAL
AUTHOR
Essays on Various SubjectIII
TITLE
DATE LOANED | BORROWER'S NAME | ROOM NUMBER
STORAGE - CBEL
2-3785 Clg A Storage
208.9
W755
8947